

2

A

SUPPLEMENT to the QUARTO EDITION
OF
D^R MOSHEIM'S
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY;

CONTAINING
The ADDITIONS and IMPROVEMENTS
Inferted in the OCTAVO EDITION of that Work;

And, among others,
A DEFENCE of the FIRST REFORMERS against Mr. HUME,
Some Thoughts on the PRESENT STATE of the Reformed Religion, and the
Influence of Improvements in Science on its Propagation, &c.

AND
An Historical Account of the Correspondence between Archbishop WAKE and the
Doctors of the SORBONNE, concerning a Projected Union between the
ENGLISH and GALRICAN CHURCHES.

By ARCHIBALD MACLAINE, D. D.

L O N D O N,
Printed for A. MILLAR; and sold by T. CADELL, in *The Strand*. MDCCLXVIII.



ADVERTISEMENT to the OCTAVO EDITION.

THE favourable reception, which the *first* edition of this work met with, has encouraged the translator to employ his utmost care in rendering the *second* still less unworthy of the acceptance of the public. He has corrected a passage, erroneously translated in the second volume, at the 574th page of the quarto edition; and he has revised the whole with a degree of attention, which he hopes will secure him against the charge of any other inadvertency. He takes this opportunity of acknowledging the goodness of the learned and worthy Dr. NEVE of *Middleton Stoney*, who favoured him with several Notes and with some hundreds of Additional Articles and Corrections for the INDEX. Many of these are inserted in this edition, and an N subjoined to each to distinguish them from those of the translator *.

The editor has published apart, in *quarto*, the corrections and additional notes and dissertations, that the purchasers of the *first edition* may have no reason to complain.

* These Notes, and the Additions to the Index, are all inserted in this Supplement to the quarto edition.

ADVERTISEMENT to the OCTAVO EDITION.

THE favourable reception, which the 8vo edition of this work met with, has encouraged the translator to employ his utmost care in rendering the second still less unworthy of the acceptance of the public. He has corrected a passage, erroneously translated in the second volume, at the 274th page of the quarto edition; and he has revised the whole with a degree of attention, which he hopes will secure him against the charge of any other inaccuracy. He takes this opportunity of acknowledging the goodness of the learned and worthy Dr. Nave of Münster Steyn, who favoured him with several Notes and with some hundreds of Additional Articles and Corrections for the Index. Many of these are inserted in this edition, and an IV. is joined to each to distinguish them from those of the translator.

The editor has published again, in quarto, the corrections and additional notes and dissertations, that the purchasers of the 8vo edition may have no reason to complain.

* These Notes, and the Address to the Index, are all inserted in this Supplement to the quarto edition.

APPENDIXES
TO
MOSHEIM'S
ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

APPENDIX I.

Concerning the SPIRIT and CONDUCT of the first Reformers, and the charge of ENTHUSIASM (i. e. fanaticism), that has been brought against them by a celebrated author.

THE candour and impartiality, with which Dr. MosHEIM represents the transactions of those who were agents and instruments in bringing about the reformation, are highly laudable. He acknowledges, that imprudence, passion, and even a low self-interest, mingled sometimes their rash proceedings and ignoble motives in this excellent cause; and, in the very nature of things, it could not be otherwise. It is one of the most inevitable consequences of the subordination and connexions of civil society, that many improper instruments and agents are set to work in all great and important revolutions, whether of a religious or political nature. When great men appear in these revolutions, they draw after them their dependants; and the unhappy effects of a party-spirit are unavoidably displayed in the best cause. The subjects follow their prince; the multitude adopt the system of their leaders, without entering into its true spirit, or being judiciously attentive to the proper methods of promoting it; and thus irregular proceedings are employed in the maintenance of the truth. Thus it happened in the important revolution, that delivered a great part of *Europe* from the ignominious

APPEND.
I.

APPEND.

I.

yoke of the Roman pontif. The sovereigns, the ecclesiastics, the men of weight, piety, and learning, who arose to assert the rights of human nature, the cause of genuine Christianity, and the exercise of religious liberty, came forth into the field of controversy, with a multitude of dependants, admirers, and friends, whose motives and conduct cannot be entirely justified. Besides; when the eyes of whole nations were opened upon the iniquitous absurdities of popery, and upon the tyranny and insolence of the Roman pontifs, it was scarcely possible to set bounds to the indignation of an incensed and tumultuous multitude, who are naturally prone to extremes, generally pass from blind submission to lawless ferocity, and too rarely distinguish between the use and abuse of their undoubted rights. In a word, many things, which appear to us extremely irregular in the conduct and measures of *some* of the instruments of our happy reformation, will be entitled to a certain degree of indulgence, if the spirit of the times, the situation of the contending parties, the barbarous provocations of popery, and the infirmities of human nature, be duly and attentively considered.

The question here is, what was the *spirit* which animated the *first* and *principal reformers*, who arose in times of darkness and despair to deliver oppressed kingdoms from the dominion of *Rome*, and upon what principles a LUTHER, a ZUINGLE, a CALVIN, a MELANCTHON, a BUCER, &c. embarked in the arduous cause of the reformation? This question, indeed, is not at all necessary to the defence of the reformation, which rests upon the strong foundations of scripture and reason, and whose excellence is absolutely independent on the virtues of those who took the lead in promoting it. Bad men may be, and often are, embarked in the best causes; as such causes afford the most specious mask to cover mercenary views, or to disguise ambitious purposes. But, until the more than jesuitical and disingenuous PHILIPS resumed the trumpet of calumny [a], even the voice of popery had ceased to attack the moral characters of the leading reformers.

These eminent men were, indeed, attacked from another quarter, and by a much more respectable writer. The truly ingenious Mr. HUME, so justly celebrated as one of the first favourites of the historical Muse, has, in his *History of England*, and more especially in the *History of the houses of TUDOR and STUART*, represented the character and temper of the *first reformers* in a point of view, which undoubtedly shews, that he had not considered them with that close and impartial attention, that ought always to precede personal reflexions. He has laid it down as a principle, that SUPERSTITION and ENTHUSIASM are *two species of religion*, that stand in *diametrical opposition* to each other; and seems to establish it as a fact, that the *former* is the genius of popery, and the *latter*, the characteristic of the reformation. Both the *principle* and its *application* must appear extremely singular; and three sorts of persons must be more especially surprized at it.

[a] See the various answers that were made to this biographer by the ingenious Mr. PYE, the learned Dr. NEVE, and other commendable writers, who have appeared in this controversy.

First, Persons of a philosophical turn, who are accustomed to study human nature, and to describe with precision both its regular and eccentric movements, must be surprized to see *superstition* and *fanaticism* [b] represented as opposite and jarring qualities. They have been seen often together, holding with each other a most friendly correspondence; and, indeed, if we consider their nature and their essential characters, their union will appear not only possible, but in some cases natural, if not necessary. *Superstition*, which consists in *false* and *abject* notions of the Deity, in the gloomy and groundless fears of invisible beings, and in the absurd rites, that these notions and these fears naturally produce, is certainly at the root of various branches of fanaticism. For what is *fanaticism*, but the visions, illuminations, impulses, and dreams of an over-heated fancy, converted into rules of faith, hope, worship and practice? This fanaticism, as it springs up in a melancholy or a cheerful complexion, assumes a variety of aspects, and its morose and gloomy forms are certainly most congenial with superstition in its proper sense. It was probably this consideration that led the author of the article *Fanaticism*, in the famous *Dictionnaire Encyclopedique*, published at *Paris*, to define it [c] as *a blind and passionate zeal, which ariseth from SUPERSTITIOUS opinions, and leads its votaries to commit ridiculous, unjust, and cruel actions, not only without shame, but even with certain internal feelings of joy and comfort*, from which the author concludes, that *FANATICISM is really nothing more than SUPERSTITION set in motion*. This definition unites perhaps too closely these two kinds of *false* religion, whose enormities have furnished very ill-grounded pretexts for discrediting and misrepresenting the *true*. It is however a testimony, from one of the pretended oracles of modern philosophy, in favour of the compatibility of *fanaticism* with *superstition*. These two principles are evidently distinct; because *superstition* is, generally speaking, the effect of ignorance, or of a judgment perverted by a sour and splenetic temper; whereas *fanaticism* is the offspring of an inflamed imagination, and may exist where there is no superstition, *i. e.* no false or gloomy notions of the divinity. But, though distinct, they are not opposite principles; on the contrary, they lend, on many occasions, mutual strength and assistance to each other.

If persons accustomed to philosophical precision will not relish the maxim of the celebrated writer, which I have been now considering; so neither, in the *second place*, can those who are versed in ecclesiastical history, look upon *superstition* as a more predominant characteristic of popery than *fanaticism*; and yet this is a leading idea, which is not only visible in many parts of this author's excellent History, but appears to be the basis of all the reflexions he employs, and of all the epithets he uses, in his speculations upon the Romish religion.

[b] I use the word *fanaticism* here instead of *enthusiasm*, to prevent all ambiguity; because, as shall be shewn presently, Mr. HUME takes *enthusiasm* in its worst sense, when he applies it to the reformers; and in that sense it is not only equivalent to, but is perfectly synonymous with, *fanaticism*. Besides, this latter term is used indiscriminately with *enthusiasm* by this celebrated Historian in characterizing the reformation.

[c] The words of the original are: *Le fanatisme est un zele aveugle et passionné, qui naît des opinions superstitieuses, et fait commettre des actions ridicules, injustes et cruelles, non seulement sans honte, mais avec une sorte de joye et de consolation. Le fanatisme donc n'est que la superstition mise en mouvement.*

APPENDICES TO MOSHEIM'S

4
APPEND.
I.

And nevertheless it is manifest, that the multitudes of fanatics, which arose in the church of *Rome* before the reformation, are truly innumerable; and the operations of fanaticism in that church were, at least, as visible and frequent, as the restless workings of superstition; they went, in short, hand in hand, and united their visions and their terrors in the support of the papacy. It is, more especially, well known, that the greatest part of the monastic establishments (that alternately insulted the benignity of Providence by their austerities, and abused it by their licentious luxury), were originally founded in consequence of pretended illuminations, miraculous dreams, and such like wild delusions of an over-heated fancy. Whenever a new doctrine was to be established, that could augment the authority of the pope, or fill the coffers of the clergy; whenever a new convent was to be erected, there was always a vision or a miracle ready, to facilitate the business; nor must it be imagined, that forgery and imposture were the only agents in this matter;—by no means;—imposture there was; and it was frequently employed; but impostors made use of fanatics; and in return fanatics found impostors, who spread abroad their fame, and turned their visions to profit. Were I to recount, with the utmost simplicity, without the smallest addition of ludicrous embellishment, the extasies, visions, seraphic amours, celestial apparitions, that are said to have shed such an odour of sanctity upon the male and female saints of the Romish church; were I to pass in review the famous *conformities* of St. FRANCIS, the illuminations of St. IGNATIUS, and the enormous cloud of fanatical witnesses, that have dishonoured humanity in bearing testimony to popery, this dissertation would become a voluminous history. Let the reader cast an eye upon Dr. MOSHEIM's account of those ages that more immediately preceded the reformation, and he will see what a number of sects, *purely fanatical*, arose in the bosom of the Romish church.

But this is not all—for it must be carefully observed, that even those extravagant fanatics, who produced such disorders in *Germany* about the commencement of the reformation, were nursed in the bosom of popery, were professed papists before they adopted the cause of LUTHER, nay, many of them passed directly from popery to fanaticism, without even entering into the outward profession of Lutheranism. It is also to be observed, that besides the fanatics, who exposed themselves to the contempt of the wise upon the publick theatre of popery, SECKENDORF speaks of a sect that merits this denomination, which had spread in the *Netherlands*, before LUTHER raised his voice against popery, and whose members were engaged, by the terror of penal laws, to dissemble their sentiments; nay, even affected a devout compliance with the external rites of the established worship, until religious liberty, introduced by the reformation, encouraged them to pull off the mask, and propagate their opinions, several of which were licentious and profane.

But in the *third place*, the friends of the reformation must naturally be both surprized and displeased to find *enthusiasm*, or *fanaticism*, laid down by Mr. HUME, as the character and spirit of its founders and abettors, without any exception, or distinction, made in favour of any one of the reformers. That *fanaticism* was visible in the conduct and spirit of many who embraced the reformation, is a fact, which I do not pretend to deny; and it may be worthy
of

of the reader's curiosity to consider, for a moment, how this came to pass. APPEND.
I.

That religious liberty, which the reformation introduced and granted (in consequence of its essential principles) indiscriminately to all, to learned and unlearned, rendered this eruption of enthusiasm inevitable. It is one of the imperfections, annexed to all human things, that our best blessings have their inconveniences, or, at least, are susceptible of abuse. As liberty is a *natural right*, but not a *discerning principle*, it could not open the door to truth without letting error and delusion come in along with it. If *reason* came forth with dignity, when delivered from the despotism of authority and the blind servitude of implicit faith; *imagination*, also set free, and less able to bear the prosperous change, came forth likewise, but with a different aspect, and exposed to view the reveries it had been long obliged to conceal.

Thus many fanatical fancies were exhibited, which neither arose from the spirit of the reformation, nor from the principles of the reformers, but which had been engendered in the bosom of popery, and which the fostering rays of liberty had disclosed; similar, in this, to the enlivening beams of the sun which fructifies *indiscriminately* the *salutary plant* in the well cultivated ground, and the *noxious weed* in a rank and neglected soil. And as the reformation had no such miraculous influence (not to speak of the imperfection that attended its infancy, and that has not yet entirely been removed from its more advanced stages), as to cure human nature of its infirmities and follies, to convert irregular passions into regular principles, or to turn men into angels before the time, it has still left the field open, both for fanaticism and superstition to sow their *tares* among the *good seed*; and this will probably be the case until the *end of the world*. It is here, that we must seek for the true cause of all that condemnable enthusiasm, that has dishonoured the christian name, and often troubled the order of civil society, at different periods of time since the reformation; and for which the reformation is no more responsible, than a free government is for the weakness or corruption of those who abuse its lenity and indulgence. The reformation established the sacred and unalienable right of private judgment; but it could not hinder the private judgment of many from being wild and extravagant.

The reformation, then, which the multiplied enormities of popery rendered so necessary, must be always distinguished from the abuses that might be and were often made of the liberty it introduced. If you ask, indeed, what was the *temper* and *spirit* of the *first* heralds of this happy reformation, Mr. HUME will tell you, *that they were universally inflamed with the highest enthusiasm*. This assertion, if taken singly, and not compared with other passages relating to the reformers, might be understood in a sense consistent with truth, nay, even honourable to the character of these eminent men. For, if by *enthusiasm* we understand that spirit of ardor, intrepidity, and generous zeal, which leads men to brave the most formidable obstacles and dangers in defence of a cause, whose excellence and importance have made a deep impression upon their minds; the first reformers will be allowed by their warmest friends to have been enthusiasts. This species of *enthusiasm* is a noble affection, when fitly placed and wisely exerted. It is this generous sensibility, this ardent feeling of the *great* and the *excellent*, that forms heroes and patriots;

APPEND. I. patriots; and without it, nothing difficult and arduous, that is attended with danger or prejudice to our temporal interests, can either be attempted with vigour, or executed with success. Nay, had this ingenious writer observed, that the ardor of the first reformers was more or less violent, that it was more or less blended with the warmth and vivacity of human passions, candour would be obliged to avow the charge.

But it is not in any of these points of view, that our eminent historian considers the spirit, temper, and enthusiasm of the first reformers. The enthusiasm he attributes to them is fanaticism in its worst sense. He speaks indeed of the *inflexible intrepidity, with which they braved dangers, torments, and even death itself*; but he calls them *the fanatical and enraged reformers*; he indicates through the whole course of his history fanaticism as the characteristic of the protestant religion and its glorious founders; the terms *protestant fanaticism*—*fanatical churches* are interspersed in various parts of this work; and we never meet with the least appearance of a distinction between the *rational* and *enthusiastic*, the *wise* and *indiscreet* friends of the reformation. In short, we find a phraseology constantly employed upon this subject, which discovers an intention to confound protestantism with enthusiasm, and to make reformers and fanatics synonymous terms. We are told, that while absurd rites and burthensome superstitions reigned in the Romish church, the reformers were *thrown, by a spirit of opposition, into an enthusiastic strain of devotion*; and in another place, that these latter *placed all merit in a mysterious species of faith in INWARD VISION, RAPTURE and EXTASY*. It would be endless to quote the passages in which this representation of things is repeated in a great variety of phrase, and artfully insinuated into the mind of the reader, by dexterous strokes of a seducing pencil; which, though scattered here and there, yet gradually unite their influence on the imagination of an uninstructed and unwary reader, and form imperceptibly an unfavourable impression of that great event, to which we owe at this day our civil and religious liberty and our deliverance from a yoke of superstitious and barbarous despotism. Protestants in all ages and places are stigmatized by Mr. HUME with very dishonourable titles; and it struck me particularly to see even the generous opposers of the Spanish inquisition in *Holland*, whose proceedings were so moderate and whose complaints were so humble, until the barbarous yoke of superstition and tyranny became intolerable; it struck me, I say, to see these generous patriots branded with the general character of *bigots*. This is certainly a severe appellation; and were it applied with much more equity than it is, I think it would still come with an ill grace from a lover of freedom, from a man who lives and writes with security, under the auspicious shade of that very liberty, which the reformation introduced, and for which the Belgic heroes (or *bigots*—if we must call them so) shed their blood. I observe with pain, that the phraseology employed perpetually by Mr. HUME, on similar occasions, seems to discover a keen dislike of every opposition made to power in favour of the reformation. Nay, upon the too general principle, which this eminent writer has diffused through his history, we shall be obliged to brand with the opprobrious mark of fanaticism, those generous friends of civil and religious liberty, who, in the Revolution in 1688, op-

posed

posed the measures of a popish prince and an arbitrary government; and to APPEND.
rank the BURNETS, TILLOTSONS, STILLINGFLEETS, and other *immortal* orna-
ments of the protestant name, among the enthusiastic tribe; it is a question,
whether even a BOYLE, a NEWTON, or a LOCKE, will escape a censure,
which is lavished without mercy and without distinction.—But my present
business is with the *first reformers*, and to them I return.

Those who, more especially, merit that title were LUTHER, ZUINGLE, CALVIN, MELANCTHON, BUCER, MARTYR, BULLINGER, BEZA, OECOLAMPADIUS, and others. Now these were all men of learning, who came forth into the field of controversy (in which the fate of future ages, with respect to liberty, was to be decided) with a kind of arms, that did not at all give them the aspect of persons agitated by the impulse or seduced by the delusions of fanaticism. They pretended not to be called to the work they undertook by visions, or internal illuminations and impulses;—they never attempted to work miracles, nor pleaded a Divine commission;—they taught no new religion, nor laid claim to any extraordinary vocation;—they respected government, practised and taught submission to civil rulers, and desired only the liberty of that conscience, which God has made free, and which ceases to be conscience, if it be not free.—They maintained, that the faith of Christians was to be determined by the word of God alone;—they had recourse to reason and argument, to the rules of sound criticism, and to the authority and light of history.—They translated the scriptures into the popular languages of different countries, and appealed to them as the only test of religious truth. They exhorted Christians to judge for themselves, to search the scriptures, to break asunder the bonds of ignorant prejudice and lawless authority, and to assert that liberty of conscience to which they had an unalienable right, as reasonable beings. Mr. HUME himself acknowledges, that they offered to submit *all religious doctrines to private judgment, and exhorted every one to examine the principles formerly imposed upon him*. In short, it was their great and avowed purpose to oppose the gross corruptions and the spiritual tyranny of Rome [d], of which Mr. HUME himself complains with a just indignation, and which he censures in as keen and vehement terms as those which were used by LUTHER and CALVIN in their warmest moments.

I have already insinuated, and I acknowledge it here again, that the zeal of the reformers was sometimes intemperate; but I cannot think this circumstance sufficient to justify the aspersions of *fanaticism*, which is cast both on the spirit of the reformation and the principal agents concerned in it. A man may be over-zealous in the advancement of, what he supposes to be, the true religion, without being entitled to the denomination of a *fanatic*; unless we depart from the usual sense of this word, which is often enough employed, to have acquired, before this time, a determinate signification. The intemperate zeal of the reformers was the result of that ardour, which

[d] See the sensible and judicious *Letters on Mr. HUME's History of Great-Britain* (such is the title), that were published at *Edinburgh*, in the year 1756; and in which some points, which I have barely mentioned here, are enlarged upon, and illustrated in an ample and satisfactory manner.

APPEND.

I.

takes place in all divisions and parties, that are founded upon objects of real or supposed importance; and it may be affirmed, that, in such circumstances, the most generous minds, filled with a persuasion of the goodness of their end and of the uprightness of their intentions, are the most liable to transgress the exact bounds of moderation, and to adopt measures, which, in the calm hour of deliberate reflexion, they themselves would not approve. In all great divisions, the warmth of natural temper,—the provocations of unjust and violent opposition,—a spirit of sympathy, which connects, in some cases, the most dissimilar characters, renders the mild violent, and the phlegmatic warm—nay, frequently the pride of conquest, which mingles itself, imperceptibly, with the best principles and the most generous views, all these produce or nourish an intemperate zeal; and this zeal is, in some cases, almost inevitable. On the other hand, it may be suspected, that some writers, and Mr. HUME among others, may have given too high colours to their descriptions of this intemperate zeal. There is a passage of Sir ROBERT COTTON, that has much meaning: “most men (*says he*) grew to be frozen in zeal and “benumbed, so that whosoever pretended a little *spark of earnestness*, he “seemed no less than red fire hot, in comparison of the other.”

Nothing can be more foreign from my temper and sentiments, than to plead the cause of an excessive zeal. More especially every kind of zeal that approaches to a spirit of intolerance and persecution ought to be regarded with aversion and horror by all who have at heart the interests of genuine Christianity, and the happiness of civil society. There may be, nevertheless, cases, in which a zeal (not that breathes a spirit of persecution, but) that mounts to a certain degree of intemperance, may be not only inevitable, but useful; nay, not only *useful*, but *necessary*. This assertion I advance almost against my will—because it is susceptible of great and dangerous abuse—the assertion however is true, though the cases must be singularly important and desperate to which such zeal may be applied. It has been observed, that the reformation was one of these cases, and, all things attentively considered, the observation appears to be entirely just; and the violence of expression and vehement measures employed by some of the reformers *might have been* (I do not say that they *really were*) as much the effect of provident reflexion, as of natural fervour and resentment. To a calculating head, which considered closely, in these times of corruption and darkness, the strength of the court of *Rome*, the luxury and despotism of the pontifs, the ignorance and licentiousness of the clergy, the superstition and stupidity of the people; in a word, the deep root which the papacy had gained through all these circumstances combined, what was the first thought that must naturally have occurred? No doubt, the improbability, that cool philosophy, dispassionate reason and affectionate remonstrances would ever triumph over these multiplied and various supports of popery. And, if a calculating head must have judged in this manner, a generous heart, which considered the blessings that must arise upon mankind with religious liberty and a reformation of the church, would naturally be excited to apply, even, a violent remedy if that were *necessary*, to remove such a desperate and horrible disease. It would really seem, that LUTHER acted on such a view of things. He began mildly,

mildly, and did not employ the fire of his zeal, before he saw that it was essential to the success of his cause. Whoever looks into Dr. MOSHEIM's history, or any other impartial account of the XVIth century, will find, that LUTHER's opposition to the infamous traffic of indulgences was carried on, at first, in the most submissive strain, by humble remonstrances, addressed to the pope, and the most eminent prelates of the church. These remonstrances were answered, not only by the despotic voice of authority, but also by opprobrious invectives, perfidious plots against his person, and the terror of penal laws. Even under these he maintained his tranquillity; and his conduct at the famous diet of *Worms*, though resolute and steady, was nevertheless both respectful and modest. But when all gentle measures proved ineffectual, then, indeed, he acted with redoubled vigour, and added a new degree of warmth and impetuosity to his zeal; and (I repeat it) reflexion might have dictated those animated proceedings, which were owing, perhaps, merely to his resentment, and the natural warmth of his temper inflamed by opposition. Certain it is, at least, that neither the elegant satires of ERASMUS (had he even been a friend to the cause of liberty) nor the timid remonstrances of the gentle MELANCTHON (who was really such) would ever have been sufficient to bring about a reformation of the church. The former made many *laugh*, the latter made some *reason*; but neither of the two could make them *act* or set them in motion. In such a crisis, bold speech and ardent resolution were necessary, to produce that happy change in the face of religion, which has crowned with inestimable blessings one part of *Europe*, and has been productive of many advantages even to the other, which censures it.

As to CALVIN, every one, who has any acquaintance with history, knows how he set out in promoting the reformation. It was by a work composed with a classic elegance of style; and which, though tinged with the scholastic theology of the times, breathes an uncommon spirit of good sense and moderation. This work was the *Institutes of the christian religion*, in which the learned writer shews, that the doctrine of the reformers was founded in scripture and reason. Nay, one of the designs of this book was to shew, that the reformers ought not to be confounded with certain *fanatics*, who, about the time of the Reformation, sprung from the bosom of the church of *Rome*, and excited tumults and commotions in several places. The French monarch (FRANCIS I) to cover with a specious pretext his barbarous persecution of the friends of the Reformation, and to prevent the resentment of the protestants in *Germany*, with whom it was his interest to be on good terms, alledged, that his severity fell, *only*, upon a sect of enthusiasts, who, under the title of *Anabaptists*, substituted their visions in the place of the doctrines and declarations of the Holy Scriptures. To vindicate the reformers from this reproach, CALVIN wrote the book now under consideration; and, though the theology, that reigns in it, be chargeable with some defects, yet it is as remote from the spirit and complexion of fanaticism, as any thing can be. Nor indeed is this spirit visible in any of the writings of CALVIN that I have perused. His commentary upon the Old and New Testament, is a production that will always be esteemed, on account of its elegant simplicity,

APPEND. I. plicity, and the evident marks it bears of an unprejudiced and impartial inquiry into the plain sense of the sacred writings, and of sagacity and penetration in the investigation of it.

If we were to pass in review the writings of the other eminent reformers, whose names have been already mentioned, we should find abundant matter to justify them in the same respect. They were men of letters, nay several of them men of taste, for the age in which they lived; they cultivated the study of languages, history and criticism, and applied themselves with indefatigable industry to these studies, which, of all others, are the least adapted to excite or nourish a spirit of *fanaticism*. They had, indeed, their errors and prejudices; nor perhaps were they few in number; but who is free from the same charge? We have ours too, though they may turn on a different set of objects. Their theology favoured somewhat of the pedantry and jarion of the schools;—how could it be otherwise, considering the dismal state of philosophy at that period? The advantages we enjoy above them, give them, at least, a title to our candour and indulgence; perhaps to our gratitude, as the instruments who prepared the way through which these advantages have been conveyed to us. To conclude, let us regret their infirmities; let us reject their errors; let us even condemn any instances of ill-judged severity and violence they may have been chargeable with;—but let us never forget, that, through perils and obstacles almost unsurmountable, they opened the path to that religious liberty, which we cannot too highly esteem, nor be too careful to improve to rational and worthy purposes.

APPENDIX II.

Some observations relative to the present state of the Reformed Religion, and the influence of improvements in philosophy and science on its propagation and advancement;

Occasioned by some passages in the preface to a book, intituled, *The CONFESSIOAL.*

IN one of the notes [a], which I added to those of Dr. MOSHEIM, in my translation of his Ecclesiastical History, I observed, that *the Reformed churches were never at such a distance from the spirit and doctrine of the church of Rome, as they are at this day;—that the improvements in science, that characterize the last and the present age, seem to render a relapse into Romish superstition morally impossible in those who have been once delivered from its baneful influence;—and that, if the dawn of science and philosophy towards the end of the sixteenth and the commencement of the seventeenth centuries was favourable to the cause of the reformation, their progress, which has a kind of influence even upon the multitude, must confirm us in the principles, that occasioned our separation from the church of Rome.* APPEND. II.

This reasoning did not appear conclusive to the ingenious author of the *Confessional*, who has accordingly made some critical reflexions upon it in the preface to that work. However, upon an impartial view of these reflexions, I find that this author's *excessive* apprehensions of the progress of Popery have had an undue influence on his method of reasoning on this subject. He supposes (*preface*, p. 59 and 60) that the improvements in science and philosophy in some Popish countries have been as considerable as in any reformed country, and afterwards asks *what intelligence we have from these Popish countries of a proportionable progress of religious reformation? Have we no reason to suspect* (adds he) *that if an accurate account were to be taken, the balance in point of conversions, in the most improved of these countries, would be greatly against the reformed religion?*

I cannot see how these observations, or rather conjectures, even were they founded in truth and fact, tend to prove my reasoning inconclusive. I observed, that the progress of science was adapted to confirm us Protestants in the belief and profession of the reformed religion; and I had here in view, as every one may see, those countries in which the Protestant religion is established: and this author answers me by observing, that the progress of the

[a] See volume ii, p. 573, of the quarto edition. This note was occasioned by my mistaking, in a moment of inadvertency, the true sense of the passage to which it relates. This mistake I have corrected in the octavo edition, and in the supplement to the quarto edition.

APPEND. II. Reformation in some Popish countries is not proportionable to the progress of science and philosophy in these countries. This surely is no answer at all; since there are in Popish countries *accidental circumstances* that counteract, in favour of Popery, the influence of those improvements in science, which are in direct opposition to its propagation and advancement; circumstances, that I shall consider presently, and which do not exist in Protestant states. This subject is interesting; and I therefore presume, that some farther thoughts upon it will not be disagreeable to the candid reader.

The sagacious author of the Confessional cannot, I think, seriously call in question the *natural* tendency of improvements in learning and science to strengthen and confirm the cause of the Reformation. For as the *foundations* of Popery are a *blind submission* to an usurped authority over the understandings and consciences of men, and an *implicit credulity* that adopts, without examination, the miracles and visions, that derive their existence from the crazy brains of fanatics, or the lucrative artifice of impostors, so it is unquestionably evident, that the progress of sound philosophy, and the spirit of free enquiry it produces, strikes directly at these foundations. I say the progress of *sound philosophy*, that the most unattentive reader may not be tempted to imagine (as the author of the Confessional has been informed, preface, p. 60.) that *improvements in philosophy have made many scepticks in all churches, reformed and unreformed*. For I am persuaded, that as *true Christianity* can never lead to *superstition*, so *true philosophy* will never be a guide to infidelity and scepticism. We must not be deceived with the name of philosophers, which some poets and wits have assumed in our days, particularly upon the continent, and which many lavish upon certain subtle refiners in dialectics, who bear a much greater resemblance of over-weening sophists, than of real sages. We must not be so far lost to all power of distinguishing, as to confound in one common mass the philosophy of a *Bacon*, a *Newton*, a *Bye*, and a *Niewentyt*, with the incoherent views and rhetorical rants of a *Bolingbroke*, or the flimsy sophistry of a *Voltaire*. And though candour must acknowledge that some men of true learning have been so unhappy as to fall into infidelity, and charity must weep to see a *HUME* and a *D'ALEMBERT* joining a set of men that are unworthy of their society, and covering a dark and uncomfortable system with the lustre of their superior talents, yet equity itself may safely affirm, that neither their science nor their genius are the causes of their scepticism.

But if the progress of science and free inquiry have a natural tendency to destroy the foundations of Popery, how comes it to pass that in Popish countries the progress of the Reformation bears no proportion to the progress of science? and how can we account for the ground which Popery (if the apprehensions of the author of the Confessional are well founded) gains even in England?

Before I answer the first of these questions, it may be proper to consider the matter of fact, and to examine, for a moment, the state of science and philosophy in Popish countries; this examination, if I am not mistaken, will confirm the theory I have laid down with respect to the influence of philosophical improvement upon true religion. Let us then turn our view first to
one

one of the most considerable countries in Europe, I mean Germany, and here we shall be struck with this undoubted fact, that it is in the Protestant part of this vast region only, that the improvements of science and philosophy appear, while the barbarism of the fifteenth century reigns as yet in those districts of the empire that profess the Romish religion. The celebrated M. D'ALEMBERT, in his treatise, intitled, *De l'abus de la Critique en matiere de Religion*, makes the following remarkable observation on this head: "We must acknowledge, *though with sorrow*, the present superiority of the Protestant universities in Germany over those of the Romish persuasion. This superiority is so striking, that foreigners, who travel through the empire, and pass from a Romish academy to a Protestant university, even in the same neighbourhood, are induced to think that they have rode, in an hour, four hundred leagues, or lived, in that short space of time, four hundred years; that they have passed from Salamanca to Cambridge, or from the times of SCOTUS to those of NEWTON." Will it be believed, (says the same author) in succeeding ages, that in the year 1750 a book was published in one of the "principal cities of Europe (Vienna) with the following title: *Systema Aristotelicum de formis substantialibus and accidentibus absolutis*, i. e. *The Aristotelian System concerning substantial forms and absolute accidents*. Will it not rather be supposed, that this date is an error of the press, and that 1550 is the true reading?" See D'ALEMBERT'S *Melanges de Literature, d'Histoire & de Philosophie*, vol. iv. p. 376.—This fact seems evidently to shew the connexion that there is between improvements in science and the free spirit of the Reformed religion. The state of letter and philosophy in Italy and Spain, where canon law, monkish literatures, and scholastick metaphysics have reigned during such a long course of ages, exhibits the same gloomy spectacle. Some rays of philosophical light are now breaking through the cloud in Italy; BOSCOVICH, and some geniuses of the same stamp, have dared to hold up the lamp of science, without feeling the rigour of the inquisition, or meeting with the fate of GALILEI. If this dawning revolution be brought to any degree of perfection, it may, in due time, produce effects, that at present we have little hopes of.

France, indeed, seems to be the country, which the author of the *Confessional* has principally in view, when he speaks of a considerable progress in philosophy in Popish states that has not been attended with a proportionable influence on the reformation of religion. He even imagines, that *if an account were to be taken, the balance, in point of conversions, in this most improved of the Popish countries, would be greatly against the Reformed religion*. The reader will perceive, that I might grant this, without giving up any thing that I maintained in the note which this judicious author censures. I shall, however, examine this notion, that we may see whether it is to be adopted without restriction; and perhaps it may appear, that the improvements in philosophy have had more influence on the spirit of religion in France than this author is willing to allow.

And here I observe, in the first place, that it is no easy matter, either for him or for me to calculate the number of conversions, that are made on both sides, by priests armed with the secular power, and Protestant ministers discouraged

APPEND. II. — encouraged by the frowns of government and the terrors of persecution. If we judge of this matter by the external face of things, the calculation may, indeed, be favourable to his hypothesis, since the *apostate Protestant* comes forth to view and is publicly enrolled in the registers of the church, while the *converted Papist* is obliged to conceal his profession and to approach the truth, like *Nicodemus*, *secretly and by night*. This evident diversity of circumstances, in the respective proselytes, shews that we are not to form our judgment by external appearances, and renders it but equitable to presume, that the progress of knowledge may have produced many examples of the progress of reformation, which do not strike the eye of the publick. Is it not, in effect, to be presumed, that if either a *toleration*, or even an indulgent connivance, were granted to French Protestants, many would appear friends of the reformation, who, at present, have not sufficient strength of mind to become martyrs, or confessors in its cause? History informs us of the rapid progress the Reformation made in France in former times, when a legal toleration was granted to its friends. When this toleration was withdrawn, an immense number of Protestants abandoned their country, their relations, and their fortunes, for the sake of their religion. But when that abominable system of tyranny was set up, which would neither permit the Protestants to profess their religion at home, nor to seek for the enjoyment of religious liberty abroad, and when they were thus reduced to the sad alternative of dissimulation or martyrdom, the courage of many failed, though their persuasion remained the same. In the South of France, many continued, and still continue their profession, even in the face of those booted apostles, who are sent, from time to time, to dragoon them into Popery. In other places (particularly in the metropolis, where the empire of the mode, the allurements of court-favour, the dread of persecution, unite their influence in favour of Popery) the publick profession of Protestantism lies under heavy discouragements, and would require a zeal that rises to heroism,—a thing too rare in modern times! In a word, a religion, like Popery, which forms the main spring in the political machine, which is doubly armed with allurements and terrors, must damp the fortitude of the feeble friend to truth, and attract the *external* respect, even of libertines, free-thinkers and scepticks.

But, in the *second place*, if it should be alledged, that men eminent for learning and genius have adhered *seriously* to the profession of Popery; the fact cannot be denied. But what does it prove? It proves only that, in such persons, there are circumstances that counteract the natural influence of learning and science. It cannot be expected that the influence of learning and philosophy will always obtain a complete victory over the attachment to a superstitious church, that is rivetted by the early prejudices of education, by impressions formed by the examples of respectable personages who have professed and defended the doctrine of that church, by an habit of veneration for authority, and by numberless associations of ideas, whose combined influence gives a wonderful bias to the mind, and renders the impartial pursuit of truth extremely difficult. Thus knowledge is acquired with an express design to strengthen previous impressions and prejudices. Thus many make considerable improvements in science, who have never once *ventured* to review their
religious

religious principles, or to examine the authority on which they have been APPEND.
taken up. II.

Others observe egregious abuses in the Romish church, and are satisfied with rejecting them in secret, without thinking them sufficient to justify a separation. This class is extremely numerous; and it cannot be said that the improvements in science have had no effect upon their religious sentiments. They are neither thorough *Papists* nor *entire* Protestants; but they are manifestly verging towards the Reformation.

Nearly allied to this class is another set of men, whose case is singular and worthy of attention. Even in the bosom of the Romish church they have tolerably just notions of the sublime simplicity and genuine beauty of the Christian religion; but, either from false reasonings upon human nature, or an observation of the powerful impressions that authority makes upon the credulity and a pompous ritual upon the senses of the multitude, imagine that Christianity in its native form is too pure and elevated for vulgar souls, and therefore countenance and maintain the absurdities of Popery, from a notion of their utility. Those who conversed intimately with the sublime FENELON, Archbishop of Cambray, have declared, that such was the nature of his sentiments with respect to the publick religion of his country.

To all this I may add, that a notion of the necessity of a *visible universal church*, and of a visible center or bond of union, has led many to adhere to the Papacy (considered in this light), who look upon some of the principal and fundamental doctrines of the Romish church to be erroneous and extravagant. Such is the case of the learned and worthy Dr. COURRAYER, whose upright fortitude in declaring his sentiments obliged him to seek an asylum in England; and who, notwithstanding his persuasion of the absurdities which abound in the Church of Rome, has never totally separated himself from its communion. And such is known to be the case with many men of learning and piety in that church.

Thus it happens, that particular and accidental circumstances counteract, in favour of Popery, the natural effects of improvements in learning and philosophy, which have their full and proper influence in Protestant countries, where any thing that resembles these circumstances, is directly in favour of the Reformed religion.

But I beg that it may be attentively observed in the *third place*, that notwithstanding all these particular and accidental obstacles to the progress of the Reformation among men of knowledge and letters, the spirit of the Reformation has, in fact, gained more ground than the ingenious author of the *Confessional* seems to imagine. I think it must be allowed, that every branch of superstition that is retrenched from Popery, and every portion of authority that is taken from its Pontif, is a real gain to the cause of the Reformation, and though it does not render that cause absolutely triumphant, yet prepares the way for its progress and advancement. Now (in this point of view), I am persuaded it will appear, that, for twenty or thirty years past, the Reformation, or at least its spirit, has rather gained than lost ground in Roman Catholick states. In several countries, and more particularly in France, many of the gross abuses of Popery have been corrected. We have seen the
faintly

APPEND. faintly *Legend*, in many places, deprived of its fairest honours. We have
 II. seen a mortal blow given in *France* to the absolute power of the Pope.

What is still more surprizing, we have seen, even in Spain and Portugal, strong lines of a spirit of opposition to the pretended infallible Ruler of the Church. We have seen the very Order, that has been always considered as the chief support of the Papacy, the Order of the Jesuits, the fundamental characteristick of whose *Institute* is an inviolable obligation to extend, beyond all limits, the despotick authority of the Roman Pontifs, we have seen, I say, that order suppressed, banished, covered with deserved infamy, in three powerful kingdoms [b]; and we see, at this moment, their credit declining in other Roman Catholick states. We see, in several Popish countries, and more especially in France, the Holy Scriptures more generally in the hands of the people, than in former times. We have seen the Senate of Venice, not many months ago, suppressing, by an express edict [c], the officers of the Inquisition in all the small towns, reducing their power to a shadow in the larger cities, extending the Liberty of the Press; and all this in a steady opposition to the repeated remonstrances of the court of Rome. These, and many other facts that might be collected here, facts of a recent date, shew that the essential spirit of Popery, which is a spirit of unlimited despotism in the pretended head of the Church, and a spirit of blind submission and superstition in its members, is rather losing than gaining ground, even in those countries that still profess the religion of Rome.

If this be the case, it would seem, indeed, very strange, that Popery, which is losing ground at home, should be gaining it abroad, and acquiring new strength, as some imagine, even in Protestant countries. This, at first sight, must appear a paradox of the most enormous size; and it is to be hoped, that it will continue to appear such, upon the closest examination.—While the spirit and vigour of Popery are actually declining on the continent, I would fondly hope, that the apprehensions of some worthy persons, with respect to its progress in England, are without foundation. To account for the growth of Popery in an age of light, would be incumbent upon me, if the *fact* were true. Until this fact be *proved*, I may be excused from undertaking such a task. The famous story of the *golden tooth*, that employed the laborious researches of physicians, chemists, and philosophers, stands upon record, as a warning to those, who are over-hasty to account for a thing which has no existence. My distance from England, during many years past, renders me, indeed, less capable of judging concerning the state of Popery there, than those who are upon the spot. I shall therefore confine myself to a few reflexions upon this interesting subject.

When it is said that Popery gains ground in England, one of the two following things must be meant by this expression; either that the spirit of the established and other Reformed churches is leaning that way,—or that a number of individuals are made proselytes, by the seduction of Popish emissaries, to the Romish communion. With respect to the established church, I think

[b] In France, Spain, and Portugal.

[c] This edict was issued out in the month of February, 1767.

that a candid and accurate observer must vindicate it from the charge of a spirit of approximation to Rome. We do not live in the days of a *Laud*; — APPEND. II. — nor do his successors seem to have imbibed his spirit. I don't hear that the claims of church-power are carried high in the present times, or that a spirit of intolerance characterizes the Episcopal hierarchy. And though it were to be wished, that the case of Subscription were to be made easier to good and learned men, whose scruples deserve indulgence, and were better accommodated to what is known to be the reigning theology among the Episcopal clergy, yet it is straining matters too far to alledge the demand of Subscription, as a proof that the established church is verging towards Popery. As to the Protestant dissenting churches in England and Ireland, they stand so avowedly clear of all imputations of this nature, that it is utterly unnecessary to vindicate them on this head. If any thing of this kind is to be apprehended from any quarter within the pale of the Reformation, it is from the quarter of *Fanaticism*, which, by discrediting free inquiry, crying down human learning, and encouraging those pretended *illuminations* and *impulses* which give *imagination* an undue ascendant in religion, lays weak minds open to the seductions of a church, which has always made its conquests by wild visions and false miracles, addressed to the passions and fancies of men. Cry down reason, preach up implicit faith, extinguish the lamp of free inquiry, make inward *experience* the test of truth; and then the main barriers against Popery will be removed. Persons, who follow this METHOD, possibly *may* continue Protestants; but there is no security against their becoming Papists, if the occasion is presented. Were they placed in a scene where artful priests and enthusiastick monks could play their engines of conversion, their Protestant faith would be very likely to fail.

If by the supposed growth of Popery be meant, the success of the Romish emissaries in making proselytes to their communion; here again the question turns upon a matter of fact, upon which I cannot venture to pronounce. There is no doubt, but the Romish hierarchy carries on its operations under the shade of an indulgent connivance; and it is to be feared that its members are *wiser, i. e.* more artful and zealous *in their generation, than the children of light*. The establishment of the Protestant religion inspires, it is to be feared, an indolent security into the hearts of its friends. Ease and negligence are the fruits of prosperity, and this maxim extends even to religion. It is not unusual to see a victorious general sleep upon his laurels, and thus give advantage to an enemy, whom adversity renders vigilant. All good and true Protestants will heartily wish that this were otherwise. They will be sincerely afflicted at any decline that may happen in the zeal and vigilance that ought ever to be employed against Popery and Popish emissaries, since they can never cease to consider Popery as a system of wretched superstition and political despotism, and must particularly look upon Popery in the British Isles as pregnant with the principles of disaffection and rebellion, and as at invariable enmity with our religious liberty and our happy civil constitution. But still there is reason to hope, that Popery makes very little progress, notwithstanding the apprehensions that have been entertained on this subject. The insidious publications of a TAAFE and a PHILIPS, who abuse

APPEND. II. the terms of charity, philanthropy, and humanity, in their flimsy apologies for a church, whose *tender mercies* are known to be *cruel*, have alarmed many well-meaning persons. But it is much more wise, as well as noble, to be vigilant and steady against the enemy, than to take the alarm at the smallest of his motions, and to fall into a panick, as if we were conscious of our weakness. Be that as it will, I return to my first principle, and am still persuaded, that the Protestant church, and *its prevailing spirit*, are, at this present time, as averse to Popery, as they were at any period since the Reformation, and that the thriving state of learning and philosophy is adapted to confirm them in this well-founded aversion. Should it even be granted, that proselytes to Popery have been made among the *ignorant* and unwary, by the emissaries of Rome, this would by no means invalidate what I here maintain; though it may justly be considered as a powerful incentive to the zeal and vigilance of rulers temporal and spiritual, of the pastors and people of the Reformed churches, against the encroachments of Rome.

The author of the *Confessional* complains, and perhaps justly, of the bold and publick appearance, which Popery has of late made in England. "The Papists, *says he*, strengthened and animated by an influx of *Jesuits*, expelled even from Popish countries, for crimes and practices of the worst complexion, open publick Mass-houses, and affront the laws of this Protestant kingdom in other respects, not without insulting some of those who endeavour to check their insolence.—And we are told, with the utmost coolness and composure, that—*Popish Bishops* go about here, and exercise every part of their function, *without offence, and without observation.*" This is, indeed, a circumstance, that the friends of Reformation and religious liberty cannot behold without offence; I say, the friends of religious liberty; because the maintenance of all liberty, both civil and religious, depends on circumscribing Popery within proper bounds; since Popery is not a system of *innocent* speculative opinions, but a yoke of despotism, an enormous mixture of princely and priestly tyranny, designed to enslave the consciences of mankind, and to destroy their most sacred and invaluable rights. But, at the same time, I don't think we can, from this publick appearance of Popery, rationally conclude that it gains ground, much less (as the author of the *Confessional* suggests), *that the two hierarchies (i. e. the Episcopal and the Popish) are growing daily more and more into a resemblance of each other.* The natural reason of this bold appearance of Popery is the spirit of toleration, that has been carried to a great height, and has rendered the execution of the laws against Papists, in the time past, less rigorous and severe.

How it may be proper to act with regard to the growing insolence of Popery, is a matter that must be left to the wisdom and clemency of Government. Rigour against any thing, that bears the name of a *Religion*, gives pain to a candid and generous mind; and it is certainly more eligible to extend *too far*, than to circumscribe too narrowly, the bounds of forbearance, and indulgent charity.

If the dangerous tendency of Popery, considered as a pernicious system of policy, should be pleaded as a sufficient reason to except it from the indulgence

indulgence due to *merely speculative* systems of Theology ;—if the voice of History should be appealed to, as declaring the assassinations, rebellions, conspiracies, the horrid scenes of carnage and desolation, that Popery has produced ;—if standing principles and maxims of the Roman church should be quoted, which authorize these enormities ;—if it should be alledged, finally, that Popery is much more malignant and dangerous in Great Britain than in any other Protestant country ; I acknowledge that all these pleas against Popery are well founded ; and plead for modifications to the connivance which the clemency of government may think proper to grant to that unfriendly system of religion. All I wish is, that mercy and humanity may ever accompany the execution of justice ; and that nothing like *merely religious* persecution may stain the British annals. And all I maintain with respect to the chief point under consideration is, that the publick appearance of Popery, which is justly complained of, is no *certain* proof of its growth, but rather shews its indiscretion than its strength, and the declining vigour of *our* zeal than the growing influence of *its* maxims.

APPENDIX III.

A circumstantial and exact Account of the Correspondence, that was carried on in the Year 1717 and 1718, between Dr. WILLIAM WAKE, Archbishop of Canterbury, and certain Doctors of the Sorbonne at Paris, relative to a Project of Union between the English and Gallican Churches.

———Magis amica veritas.

APPEND.
III.

WHEN the famous BOSSUET, Bishop of *Meaux*, laid an insidious snare for unthinking Protestants, in his artful *Exposition of the Doctrine of the Church of Rome*, the pious and learned Dr. WAKE unmasked this deceiver, and the Writings he published on this occasion gave him a distinguished rank among the victorious champions of the Protestant cause. Should any person, who had perused these writings, be informed, that this pretended Champion of the Protestant religion had set on foot a project for union with a Popish church, and that with concessions in favour of the grossest superstition and idolatry [d], he would be apt to stare; at least, he would require the strongest possible evidence for a fact, in all appearance, so contradictory and unaccountable. This accusation has, nevertheless, been brought against the eminent Prelate, by the ingenious and intrepid author of the *Confessional*, and it is founded upon an extraordinary passage in Dr. MOSHEIM'S Ecclesiastical History; where we are told, that Dr. WAKE formed a project of peace and union between the English and Gallican churches, founded upon this condition, that each of the two communities should retain the greatest part of their respective and peculiar doctrines [e].

This

[d] See the *Confessional*, 2d edition, *Pref.* p. lxxvi.

[e] See the English Translation of Mosheim's History, Vol. II. p. 576. Dr. MOSHEIM had certainly a very imperfect idea of this correspondence; and he seems to have been misled by the account of it, which KIORNINGIUS has given, in his Dissertation *De Consecrationibus Episcoporum Anglorum*, published at Helmstadt in 1739; which account, notwithstanding the means of information its author seemed to have by his journey to England, and his conversations with Dr. COURRAYER, is full of mistakes. Thus KIORNINGIUS tells us, that Dr. WAKE submitted to the judgment of the Romish doctors, his correspondents, the conditions of peace between the two churches, which he had drawn up; — that he sent a learned man (Dr. WILKINS, his chaplain) to Paris, to forward and complete, if possible, the projected union; — that in a certain assembly, held at Paris, the difficulties of promoting this union without the Pope's concurrence, were insisted upon by some men of high rank, who seemed inclined to

This passage, though it is, perhaps, too uncharitably interpreted by the author already mentioned, would furnish, without doubt, just matter of censure, were it founded in truth. I was both surprized and perplexed, while I was translating it. I could not procure immediately proper information with respect to the fact, nor could I examine MOSHEIM's proofs of this strange assertion, because he alledged none. Destitute of materials, either to invalidate or confirm the fact, I made a slight mention, in a short note, of a correspondence, which had been carried on between Archbishop Wake and Dr. Du Pin, with the particulars of which I was not acquainted; and, in this my ignorance, I only made a general observation, drawn from Dr. Wake's known zeal for the Protestant religion, which was designed, not to confirm that assertion, but rather to insinuate my disbelief of it. It never could come into my head, that the interests of the Protestant religion would have been safe in Archbishop Wake's hands, had I given the smallest degree of credit to Dr. Mosheim's assertion, or even suspected that that eminent prelate was inclined to form a union between the *English and Gallican churches, founded on this condition, that each of the two communities should retain the greatest part of their respective and peculiar doctrines.*

If the author of the *Confessional* had given a little more attention to this, he could not have represented me, as confirming the fact alledged by Mosheim, much less as giving it, what he is pleased to call the *sanction* of my approbation. I did not confirm the fact; for I only said there was a correspon-

to the union, and that these difficulties put an end to the conferences;—that, however, two French divines (whom he supposes to be Du Pin and Girardin) were sent to England to propose new terms. It now happens unluckily for Mr. KIÖRNINGIUS's reputation, as an historian, that not one syllable of all this is true, as will appear sufficiently to the reader, who peruses with attention the account, and the pieces, which I here lay before the publick.—But one of the most egregious errors in the account given by KIÖRNINGIUS, is at page 61, of his Dissertation, where he says, that Archbishop WAKE was so much elated with the prospect of success in the scheme of an accommodation, that he acquainted the divines of Geneva with it, in 1719, and plainly intimated to them, that he thought it an easier thing than reconciling the Protestants with each other.—Let us now see where KIÖRNINGIUS received this information.—Why, truly, it was from a letter of Dr. WAKE to Professor TURRETIN of Geneva, in which there is not one syllable relative to a scheme of union between the English and Gallican churches; and yet KIÖRNINGIUS quotes a passage in this letter, as the only authority he has for this affirmation. The case was thus: Dr. WAKE, in the former part of his letter to Turretin, speaks of the sufferings of the Hungarian and Piedmontese churches, which he had successfully endeavoured to alleviate, by engaging King GEORGE I to intercede in their behalf, and then proceeds to express his desire of healing the differences, that disturbed the union of the Protestant churches abroad. *Interim* (says he) *dum hæc* (i. e. the endeavours to relieve the Hungarian and Piedmontese churches) *feliciter peraguntur, ignoscite, Fratres Dilectissimi, si majoris quidem laboris atque difficultatis, sed longe maximi nobis commodi inceptum vobis proponam; unionem nimirum, &c.* Professor TURRETIN, in his work, intituled, *Nubes Testium*, printed only the latter part of Dr. WAKE's letter, beginning with the words, *Interim dum hæc feliciter, uti spero, peraguntur*, and Kiorningius, not having seen the preceding part of this letter, which relates to the Hungarian and Piedmontese churches, and with which these words are connected, took it into his head that these words were relative to the scheme of union between the English and Gallican churches. Nor did he only take this into his head, by way of conjecture, but he affirms, very flurdily and positively, that the words have this signification: *Hæc verba* (says he) *tangunt pacis cum Gallis instaurandæ negotium, quod ex temporum rationibus, manifestum est.* To shew him, however, that he is grossly mistaken, I have published, among the annexed pieces (N^o XX.), the whole Letter of Archbishop Wake to Turretin.

dence

APPEND. dence on the subject, without speaking a syllable of the unpleasing *condition*,
 III. that forms the charge against Dr. *Wake*. I shall not enter here into a debate about the grammatical import of my expressions; as I have something more interesting to present to the reader, who is curious of information about Archbishop *Wake*'s *real* conduct in relation to the correspondence already mentioned. I have been favoured with authentick copies of the letters which passed in this correspondence, which are now in the hands of Mr. *Beauvoir* of Canterbury, the worthy son of the clergyman, who was chaplain to Lord *Stair* in the year 1717, and also with others, from the valuable collection of manuscripts left by Dr. *Wake* to the library of Christ's-Church College in Oxford. It is from these letters that I have drawn the following account, at the end of which, copies of them are printed, to serve as proofs of the truth of this relation, which I publish, with a disinterested regard to truth. This impartiality may be, in some measure, expected from my situation in life, which has placed me at a distance from the scenes of religious and ecclesiastical contention in England, and cut me off from those personal connexions, that nourish the prejudices of a party spirit, more than many are aware of; but it would be still more expected from my principles, were they known.

From this narrative, confirmed by authentick papers, it will appear with the utmost evidence:

Ist, That Archbishop *Wake* was not the *first mover* in this correspondence, nor the person that *formed the project of union* between the English and Gallican churches.

IIdly, That he never made any concessions, nor offered to give up, for the sake of peace, any one point of the established doctrine and discipline of the Church of England, in order to promote this union.

IIIdly, That any desires of union with the Church of Rome, expressed in the Archbishop's letters, proceeded from the hopes (well founded or illusory, is not my business to examine here) that he at first entertained of a considerable reformation in that church, and from an expectation that its most absurd doctrines would fall to the ground, if they could once be deprived of their great support, the Papal authority;—the destruction of which authority was the very basis of this correspondence.

It will further appear, that Dr. *WAKE* considered union in external worship, as one of the best methods of healing the uncharitable dissensions that are often occasioned by a variety of sentiments in point of doctrine, in which a perfect uniformity is not to be expected. This is undoubtedly a wise principle, when it is not carried too far; and whether or no it was carried too far by this eminent prelate, the candid reader is left to judge, from the following relation.

IN the month of November 1717, Archbishop *WAKE* wrote a letter to Mr. *BEAUVOIR*, chaplain to the Earl of *Stair*, then Ambassador at Paris, in which his Grace acknowledges the receipt of several obliging letters from Mr. *Beauvoir*. This is manifestly the first letter which the prelate wrote to that gentleman, and the whole contents of it are matters

of a literary nature [f]. In answer to this letter, Mr. *Beauvoir*, in one dated the 11th of December 1717, O. S. gives the Archbishop the information he desired, about the method of subscribing to a new edition of *St. Chrysostom*, which was, at that time, in the press at Paris, and then mentions his having dined with Du Pin, and three other doctors of the *Sorbonne*, who talked as if the whole Kingdom of *France* was to appeal (in the affair of the Bull *Unigenitus*) to a future General Council, and who wished for an union with the Church of England, as the most effectual means to unite all the Western Churches. Mr. *Beauvoir* adds, that Dr. *Du Pin* had desired him to give his duty to the Archbishop [g]. Here we see the first hint, the very first overture that was made, relative to a project of union between the English and Gallican churches; and this hint comes originally from the doctors of the *Sorbonne*, and is not at all occasioned by any thing contained in preceding letters from Archbishop *Wake* to Mr. *Beauvoir*, since the one only letter, which Mr. *Beauvoir* had hitherto received from that eminent prelate, was entirely taken up in inquiries about some new editions of books, that were then publishing at Paris.

Upon this, the Archbishop wrote a letter to Mr. *Beauvoir*, in which he makes honourable mention of *Du Pin*, as an author of merit; and expresses his desire of serving him, with that benevolent politeness which reigns in our learned prelate's letters, and seems to have been a striking line in his amiable character [h]. Dr. *Du Pin* improved this favourable occasion

[f] The perusal of this letter (which the reader will find among the pieces here subjoined, N^o I.) is sufficient to remove the suspicions of the author of the *Confessional*, who seems inclined to believe, that Archbishop *Wake* was the first mover in the project of uniting the English and Gallican churches. This author having mentioned Mr. *Beauvoir's* letter, in which *Du Pin's* desire of this union is communicated to the Archbishop, asks the following question: *Can any man be certain that Beauvoir mentioned this merely out of his own head, and without some previous occasion given, in the Archbishop's letter to him, for such a conversation with the Sorbonne doctors?* I answer to this question, that every one who reads the Archbishop's letter of the 28th of November, to which this letter of Mr. *Beauvoir's* is an answer, may be very certain that Dr. *Wake's* letter did not give Mr. *Beauvoir* the least occasion for such a conversation, but relates entirely to the Benedictine edition of *St. Chrysostom*, Martene's *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*, and Moreri's Dictionary. But, says our author, there is an &c. in this copy of Mr. *Beauvoir's* letter, very suspiciously placed, as if to cover something improper to be disclosed †. But really if any thing was covered here, it was covered from the Archbishop, as well as from the publick, since the very same &c. that we see in the printed copy of Mr. *Beauvoir's* letter, stands in the original. Besides, I would be glad to know, what there is in the placing of this &c. that can give rise to suspicion? The passage of *Beauvoir's* letter runs thus: *They (the Sorbonne doctors) talked as if the whole kingdom was to appeal to the future General Council, &c. They wished for a union with the Church of England, as the most effectual means to unite all the Western Churches.* It is palpably evident, that the &c. here has not the least relation to the union in question, and gives no sort of reason to suspect any thing but the spirit of discontentment, which the insolent proceedings of the Court of Rome had excited among the French divines.

[g] See the Letters subjoined, N^o II.

[h] This handsome mention of Dr. *Du Pin*, made by the Archbishop, gives new subject of suspicion to the sagacious author of the *Confessional*. He had learned the fact from the article *WAKE*, in the *Biographia Britannica*; but, says he, we are left to guess what this handsome men-

* See the 2d edition of the *Confessional*, Pref. p. lxxviii. Note W.

† The other reflexions, that the author has there made upon the correspondence between Archbishop *Wake* and the doctors of the *Sorbonne*, are examined in the following note.

APPEND. occasion of writing to the Archbishop a letter of thanks, dated ^{January 31} ^{February 11} 1717-18; in which, towards the conclusion, he intimates his desire of an union

tion was;—had the biographer given us this letter, together with that of November 27, they might, PROBABLY (it would have been more accurate to have said POSSIBLY), have discovered what the biographer did not want we should know, namely, the share Dr. Wake had in FORMING the project of an union between the two churches*. This is guessing with a witness;—and it is hard to imagine how the boldest calculator of probabilities could conclude from Dr. WAKE's handsome mention of Dr. Du Pin, that the former had a share, of any kind, in forming the project of union now under consideration. But the ingenious guesser happens to be quite mistaken in his conjecture; and I hope to convince him of this, by satisfying his desire. He desires the letter of the 27th (or rather the 28th) of November; I have referred to it in the preceding note, and he may read it at the end of this account†. He desires the letter in which handsome mention is made of *Du Pin*; and I can assure him, that in that letter there is not a single syllable relative to a union; the passage that regards Dr. *Du Pin*, is as follows: *I am much obliged to you* (says Dr. Wake, in his letter to Mr. Beauvoir, dated January 2, 1717-18) *for making my name known to Dr. Du Pin. He is a gentleman by whose labours I have profited these many years. And I do really admire how it is possible for one man to publish so much, and yet so correctly, as he has generally done. I desire my respects to him; and that if there be any thing here whereby I may be serviceable to him, he will freely command me.* Such was the Archbishop's handsome mention of *Du Pin*; and it evidently shews that, till then, there never had been any communication between them. Yet these are all the proofs which the author of the Confessional gives of the probability, that the Archbishop was the first mover in this affair.

But his Grace accepted the party, a formal treaty commences, and is carried on in a correspondence of some length, &c. says the author of the Confessional. And I would candidly ask that author, upon what principles of Christianity, reason, or charity, Dr. Wake could have refused to hear the proposals, terms, and sentiments of the Sorbonne doctors, who discovered an inclination to unite with his church? The author of the Confessional says elsewhere, that it was, at the best, officious and presumptuous in Dr. Wake, to enter into a negotiation of this nature, without authority from the church or the government‡. But the truth is, that he entered into no negotiation or treaty on this head; he considered the letters, that were written on both sides, as a personal correspondence between individuals, which could not commence a negotiation, until they had received the proper powers from their respective Sovereigns.—And I do think the Archbishop was greatly in the right to enter into this correspondence, as it seemed very likely, in the then circumstances of the Gallican church, to serve the Protestant interest, and the cause of Reformation. If, indeed, in the course of this correspondence, Dr. Wake had discovered any thing like what Mosheim imputes to him, even a disposition towards an union, founded upon the condition, that each of the two churches should retain the greatest part of their respective and peculiar doctrines, I should think his conduct liable to censure. But no such thing appears in the Archbishop's letters, which I have subjoined to this account, that the candid examiner may receive full satisfaction in this affair. Mosheim's mistake is palpable, and the author of the Confessional seems certainly to have been too hasty in adopting it. He alledges, that the Archbishop might have maintained the justice and orthodoxy of every individual article of the Church of England, and yet give up some of them for the sake of peace§. But the Archbishop expressly declares, in his letters, that he would give up none of them, and that though he was a friend to peace, he was still a greater friend to truth. The author's reflexion, that without some concessions on the part of the Archbishop, the treaty could not have gone a step farther, may be questioned in theory; for treaties are often carried on for a long time without concessions on both sides, or perhaps on either; and the Archbishop might hope, that *Du Pin*, who had yielded several things, would still yield more; but this reflexion is overturned by the plain fact. Besides, I repeat what I have already insinuated, that this correspondence does not deserve the name of a treaty§. Proposals were made only on *Du Pin*'s side, and these proposals were positively rejected by the Archbishop, in his letters to Mr. Beauvoir. Nor did he propose any thing in return to either of the Sorbonne doctors, but that they should entirely renounce the authority of the Pope, hoping, though perhaps too fancifully, that when this was done, the two churches

* Confessional, 2d edi. Pref. p. lxxviii.
p. lxxix.

† No I.

‡ Id. ib. p. lxxxv.

§ Id. ib.

§ See below, note [y], and the letters subjoined, No XI.

union between the English and Gallican churches, and observes, that the difference, in most points, between them was not so great as to render a reconciliation impracticable; and that it was his earnest wish, that all Christians were united in one sheepfold. His words are: *Unum addam cum bona venia tua, me vehementer optare, ut unionis inter Ecclesias Anglicanam & Gallicanam ineunda via aliqua inveniri possit: non ita sumus ab invicem in plerisque diffiti, ut non possimus mutuo reconciliari. Atque utinam Christiani omnes essent unum ovile.* The Archbishop wrote an answer to this letter, dated February $\frac{13}{24}$, 1717-18, in which he asserts, at large, the purity of the Church of England in Faith, Worship, Government, and Discipline, and tells his correspondent, that he is persuaded that there are few things in the doctrine and constitution of that church, which even he himself (*Du Pin*) would desire to see changed; the original words are: *Aut ego vehementer fallor, aut in ea pauca admodum sunt, quæ vel tu—immutanda velles;* and again, *Sincere judica, quid in hac nostra Ecclesia invenias, quod jure damnari debeat, aut nos atrâ hæreticorum, vel etiam schismaticorum notâ inurere.* The zeal of the venerable prelate goes still farther; and the moderate sentiments which he observed in Dr. *Du Pin's* letter induced him to exhort the French to maintain, if not to enlarge, the rights and privileges of the Gallican church, for which the present disputes, about the constitution *Unigenitus*, furnish the most favourable occasion. He also expresses his readiness to concur in improving any opportunity, that might be offered by these debates, to form a union, that might be productive of a further reformation, in which not only the most rational Protestants, but also a considerable number of the Roman Catholic churches should join with the church of England; *si ex hinc* (says the Archbishop, speaking concerning the commotions excited by the *Constitution*) *aliquid amplius elici possit ad unionem nobiscum Ecclesiasticam incundam; unde forte nova quædam Reformatio exoriatur, in quam non solum ex Protestantibus*

might come to an agreement about other matters, as far as was necessary. But the author of the *Confessional* supposes that the Archbishop must have made some concessions, because the letters on both sides were sent to Rome, and received there *as so many trophies gained from the enemies of the church.* This supposition, however, is somewhat hasty. Could nothing but concessions from the Archbishop make the court of Rome consider them in that light? Would they not think it a great triumph, that they had obliged *Du Pin's* party to give up the letters, as a token of their submission, and defeated the Archbishop's design of engaging the Gallican church to assert its liberty, by throwing off the Papal yoke? If Dr. *Wake* made concessions, where are they? And if these were the trophies, why did not the partisans of Rome publish authentick copies of them to the world? Did the author of the *Confessional* ever hear of a victorious general, who carefully hid under ground the standards he had taken from the enemy? This, indeed, is a new method of dealing with trophies. Our author, however, does not, as yet, quit his hold; he alledges, that the French divines could not have acknowledged the *Catholic benevolence* of the Archbishop, if he had made no concessions to them. This reasoning would be plausible, if charity, towards those that err, consisted in embracing their errors; but this is a definition of charity that, I fancy, the ingenious author will give up, upon second thoughts. Dr. *Wake's* Catholic benevolence consisted in his esteem for the merit and learning of his correspondents, in his compassion for their servitude and their errors, in his desire of the reformation and liberty of their church, and his propensity to live in friendship and concord, as far as was possible, with all that bear the Christian name. And this disposition, so suitable to the benevolent genius of Christianity, will always reflect a true and solid glory upon his character as a Christian Bishop.

APPEND. *optimi quique, verum etiam pars magna Ecclesiarum Communionis Romano-catholicæ una nobiscum conveniant.*

III.

Hitherto we see, that the expressions of the two learned doctors of the English and Gallican churches, relating to the union under consideration, are of a vague and general nature. When they were thus far advanced in their correspondence, an event happened, which rendered it more close, serious, and interesting, and even brought on some particular mention of preliminary terms, and certain preparatives for a future negotiation. The event I mean, was a discourse delivered, in an extraordinary meeting of the Sorbonne, March $\frac{27}{28}$, 1717-18, by Dr. *Patrick Piers de Girardin*, in which he exhorts the doctors of that society to proceed in their design of revising the doctrines and rules of the church, to separate things necessary from those which are not so, by which they will shew the church of England, that they do not hold every decision of the Pope for an *Article of Faith*. The learned orator observes farther (upon what foundation it is difficult to guess), that the English church may be more easily reconciled than the Greek was, and that the disputes between the Gallican church and the Court of Rome, removing the apprehensions of Papal tyranny, which terrified the English from the Catholick communion, will lead them back into the bosom of the church, with greater celerity than they formerly fled from it: *Facient (says he) profecto offensiones, quæ vobis inter & Senatum Capitolinum videntur intervenisse, ut Angli, deposito servitutis metu, in Ecclesiæ gremium revolent alacrius, quam olim inde, quorundam exosi tyrannidem, avolarunt. Meministis ortas inter Paulum & Barnabam dissensiones animorum tandem eo recidisse, ut singuli propagandæ in diversis regionibus Fidei felicius insudaverint sigillatim, quam junctis viribus fortasse insudassent.* This last sentence (in which Dr. *Girardin* observes, that Paul and Barnabas probably made more converts in consequence of their separation, than they would have done had they travelled together and acted in concert) is not a little remarkable; and, indeed, the whole passage discovers rather a desire of making proselytes, than an inclination to form a coalition founded upon concessions and some reformation on the side of Popery. It may, perhaps, be alledged in opposition to this remark, that prudence required a language of this kind, in the infancy of a project of union, whatever concessions might be offered afterwards to bring about its execution. And this may be true.

After the delivery of this discourse in the Sorbonne, Dr. *Du Pin* shewed to *Girardin*, Archbishop *Wake's* letter, which was also communicated to Cardinal *De Noailles*, who admired it greatly, as appears by a letter of Dr. *Piers de Girardin* to Dr. *Wake*, written, I believe, April $\frac{15}{25}$, 1718. Before the arrival of this letter, the Archbishop had received a second from Dr. *Du Pin*, and also a copy of *Girardin's* discourse. But he does not seem to have entertained any notion, in consequence of all this, that the projected union would go on smoothly. On the contrary, he no sooner received these letters, than he wrote to Mr. *Beauvoir* (April 15, 1718), that it was his opinion, that neither the Regent nor the Cardinal would ever come to a rupture with the Court of Rome; and that nothing could be done, in point of doctrine, until this rupture was brought about. He added, that *Fundamentals* should be distinguished

distinguished from matters of lesser moment, in which differences or errors might be tolerated. He expresses a curiosity to know the reception which his former letter to *Du Pin* had met with; and he wrote again to that ecclesiastick, and also to *Girardin*, May 1, 1718, and sent both his letters towards the end of that month.

APPEND.
III.

The doctors of the *Sorbonne*, whether they were set in motion by the real desire of an union with the English church, or only intended to make use of this union, as a means of intimidating the Court of Rome, began to form a plan of reconciliation, and to specify the terms upon which they were willing to bring it into execution. Mr. *Beauvoir* acquaints the Archbishop, July 16 (probably N. S.), 1718, that Dr. *Du Pin* had made a rough draught of an essay towards an union, which Cardinal *De Noailles* desired to peruse, before it was sent to his Grace; and that both *Du Pin* and *Girardin* were highly pleased with his Grace's letters to them. These letters, however, were written with a truly Protestant spirit; the Archbishop insisted, in them, upon the truth and orthodoxy of the Articles of the Church of England, and did not make any concession, which supposed the least approximation to the peculiar doctrines, or the smallest approbation of the ambitious pretensions, of the Church of Rome; he observed, on the contrary, that it was now the time for Dr. *Du Pin*, and his brethren of the *Sorbonne*, to declare openly their true sentiments, with respect to the superstition and tyranny of that church; that it was the interest of all Christians to unmask that court, and to reduce its authority to its primitive limits; and that, according to the fundamental principle of the Reformation in general, and of the Church of England in particular, Jesus Christ is the only founder, source, and head of the Church. Accordingly, when Mr. *Beauvoir* had acquainted the Archbishop with *Du Pin's* having formed a plan of union, his Grace answered in a manner which shewed that he looked upon the removal of the Gallican church from the jurisdiction of Rome as an essential preliminary article, without which no negotiation could even be commenced. "To speak freely" (says the prelate, in his letter of the 11th of August to Mr. *Beauvoir*), "I do not think the Regent (the Duke of Orleans) yet strong enough in his interest, to adventure at a separation from the Court of Rome. Could the Regent openly appear in this, the divines would follow, and a scheme might fairly be offered for such an union, as alone is requisite, between the English and Gallican church. But, till the time comes that the state will enter into such a work, all the rest is mere speculation. It may amuse a few contemplative men of learning and probity, who see the errors of the Church, and groan under the tyranny of the Court of Rome. It may dispose them secretly to wish well to us, and think charitably of us: but still they must call themselves Catholics, and us Heretics; and, to all outward appearance, say Mass, and act so as they have been wont to do. If, under the shelter of Gallican privileges, they can now and then serve the state, by speaking big in the *Sorbonne*, they will do it heartily: but that is all, if I am not greatly mistaken."

Soon after this, the Archbishop received *Du Pin's* *Commonitorium*, or advice relating to the method of re-uniting the English and Gallican churches,

APPEND. of the contents of which, it will not be improper to give here a compendious account, as it was read in the Sorbonne, and was approved of there, and as the concessions it contains, though not sufficient to satisfy a true Protestant, are yet such as one would not expect from a very zealous Papist. Dr. *Du Pin*, after some reflexions, in a tedious preface, on the Reformation, and the present state of the Church of England, reduces the controversy between the two Churches to three heads, viz. *Articles of Faith*,—*Rules and Ceremonies of Ecclesiastical Discipline*,—and *Moral Doctrine*, or rules of practice; and these he treats, by entering into an examination of the XXXIX. Articles of the Church of England. The first five of these articles he approves. With regard to the VIth, which affirms that *the Scripture contains all things necessary to salvation*, he expresses himself thus: "This we will readily grant, provided that you do not entirely exclude *Tradition*, which doth not exhibit new articles of faith, but confirms and illustrates those which are contained in the Sacred Writings, and places about them new guards to defend them against gainfayers [i]," &c. The Doctor thinks, that the *Apocryphal Books* will not occasion much difficulty. He is, indeed, of opinion, that "they ought to be deemed *Canonical*, as those books concerning which there were doubts for some time;" yet, since they are not in the first, or Jewish Canon, he will allow them to be called *Deutero-canonical*. He consents to the Xth Article, which relates to *Free-will*, provided, by the word *Power*, be understood what school-divines call *Potentia proxima*, or a direct and immediate power, since without a *remote* power of doing good works, sin could not be imputed.

With respect to the XIth Article, which contains the doctrine of *Justification*, Dr. *Du Pin* expresses thus the sentiments of his brethren: "We do not deny that it is by faith alone that we are justified, but we maintain that faith, charity, and good works, are necessary to salvation; and this is acknowledged in the following (i. e. the XIIth) Article [k]."

Concerning the XIIIth Article, the Doctor observes "that there will be no dispute, since many divines of both communions embrace the doctrine contained in that article;" (viz. *that works done before the grace of Christ are not pleasing to God,—and have the nature of sin*.) he indeed thinks "it very harsh to say, that all those actions are sinful which have not the grace of Christ for their source;" but he considers this rather as a matter of theological discussion than as a term of fraternal communion [l].

On the XIVth Article, relating to works of *Supererogation* (undoubtedly one of the most absurd and pernicious doctrines of the Romish church), Dr. *Du Pin* observes, that "works of *Supererogation* mean only

[i] The original words are: *Hoc lubenter admitteremus, modo non excludatur Traditio, quæ Articulos Fidei novos non exhibet, sed confirmat & explicat ea, quæ in Sacris Litteris habentur; ac adversus aliter sapientes munit eos novis cautionibus, ita ut non nova dicantur, sed antiqua nove.*

[k] The original words are: *Fide sola in Christum nos justificari, quod Articulo XI^{mo} exponitur, non inficiamur; sed fide, charitate & adjunctis bonis operibus, quæ omnino necessaria sunt ad salutem, ut articulo sequenti agnoscitur.*

[l] De Articulo XIII^{mo} nulla lis erit, cum multi theologi in eadem versentur sententia. Darius videtur id dici, eas omnes actiones quæ ex gratia Christi non sunt, esse peccata. Nolim tamen de hac re disceptari, nisi inter theologos.

“works conducive to salvation, which are not matters of strict precept, but APPEND.
“of counsel only; that the word, being new, may be rejected, provided it III
“be owned that the faithful do some such works.”

The Doctor makes no objections to the XV, XVI, XVII, and XVIIIth Articles.

His observation on the XIXth is, that to the definition of the church, the words, *under lawful pastors*, ought to be added; and that though all particular churches, even that of Rome, may err, it is *needless* to say this in a Confession of Faith.

He consents to the decision of the XXth Article, which refuses to the Church the power of ordaining any thing that is contrary to the Word of God; but he says, it must be taken for granted that the Church will never do this in matters which *overturn essential points of faith*, or, to use his own words, *quæ fidei substantiam evertant*.

It is in consequence of this notion that he remarks, on the XXIst Article, that General Councils, received by the Universal Church, cannot err; and that, though particular councils may, yet every private man has not a right to reject what he thinks contrary to Scripture.

As to the important points of controversy, contained in the XXIIId Article, the Doctor endeavours to mince matters as nicely as he can, to see if he can make the cable pass through the eye of the needle; and, for this purpose, observes, that souls must be *purged*, i. e. purified from all defilement of sin, before they are admitted to celestial bliss; that the Church of Rome doth not affirm this to be done by fire; that indulgences are only relaxations or remissions of temporal penalties in this life; that the Roman Catholics do not worship the cross, nor relicks, nor images, nor even saints before their images, but only pay them an external respect, which is not of a religious nature; and that even this external demonstration of respect is a matter of indifference, which may be laid aside or retained without harm.

He approves of the XXIIId Article, and does not pretend to dispute about the XXIVth, which ordains the celebration of Divine Worship in the vulgar tongue. He, indeed, excuses the Latin and Greek churches for preserving their antient languages; alledges, that great care has been taken, that every thing be understood by translations; but allows, that Divine Service may be performed in the vulgar tongue, where that is customary.

Under the XXVth Article he insists, that the Five Romish Sacraments be acknowledged as such, whether instituted immediately by Christ or not.

He approves of the the XXVIth and XXVIIth Articles; and he proposes expressing that part of the XXVIIIth that relates to *Transubstantiation* (which term he is willing to omit entirely), in the following manner: “that the Bread and Wine are really changed into the Body and Blood of Christ, which last are truly and really received by all, though none but the faithful partake of any benefit from them.” This extends also to the XXIXth Article.

Concerning the XXXth, he is for mutual toleration, and would have the receiving the Communion in both kinds held indifferent, and liberty left to each church.

APPEND. church to preserve, or change, or dispense, on certain occasions, with its
—III— customs.

He is less inclined to concessions on the XXXIIIrd Article, and maintains that the Sacrifice of Christ is not only commemorated, but continued in the Eucharist, and that every communicant offers him along with the priest.

He is not a warm stickler for the celibacy of the clergy, but consents so far to the XXXIIIrd Article, as to allow that priests may marry, where the laws of the church do not prohibit it.

In the XXXIIIrd and XXXIVth Articles, he acquiesces without exception.

He suspends his judgment with respect to the XXXVth, as he never perused the Homilies mentioned therein.

As to the XXXVth, he would not have the English ordinations pronounced null, though some of them, perhaps, are so; but thinks that, if an union be made, the English clergy ought to be continued in their offices and benefices, either by right or indulgence, *sive ex jure, sive ex indulgentia Ecclesiarum*.

He admits the XXXVIIth, so far as relates to the authority of the civil power; denies all temporal and all immediate spiritual jurisdiction of the Pope; but alleges, that by virtue of his primacy, which moderate (he ought to have said *immoderate*) Church-of-England-men don't deny, he is bound to see that the true faith be maintained, that the canons be observed every-where, and, when any thing is done in violation of either, to provide the remedies prescribed for such disorders by the canon laws, *secundum leges canonicas, ut malum resarciatur, procurare*. As to the rest, he is of opinion that every church ought to enjoy its own liberties and privileges, which the Pope has no right to infringe. He declares against going too far (the expression is vague, but the man probably meant well) in the punishment of Hereticks, against admitting the Inquisition into France, and against wars, without a just cause.

The XXXVIIIth and XXXIXth Articles he approves. Moreover, in the discipline and worship of the Church of England he sees nothing amiss, and thinks no attempts should be made to discover or prove by whose fault the schism was begun. He further observes, "that an union between the English and French bishops and clergy may be completed, or at least advanced, without consulting the Roman Pontif, who may be informed of the union as soon as it is accomplished, and may be desired to consent to it; that, if he consents to it, the affair will then be finished; and that, even without his consent, the union shall be valid; that, in case he attempts to terrify by his threats, it will then be expedient to appeal to a General Council." He concludes by observing, "that this arduous matter must first be discussed between a few; and if there be reason to hope that the bishops, on both sides, will agree about the terms of the designed union, that then application must be made to the Civil Powers, to advance and confirm the work," to which he wishes all success [m].

[m] Unio fieri potest aut saltem promoveri inconsulto Pontifice, qui facta unione, de ea admonetur, ac suppliciter rogabitur, ut velit ei consentire. Si consentiet, jam peracta res erit; sin abnuat, nihilominus valebit hæc unio. Et si minas intenet, ad Concilium Generale appellabitur.

It is from the effect which these proposals and terms made upon Archbishop Wake, that it will be most natural to form a notion of his sentiments with respect to the church of Rome. It appears evident, from several passages in the writings and letters of this eminent Prelate, that he was persuaded, that a reformation in the church of Rome could only be made gradually; that it was not probable that they would renounce all their follies at once; but that, if they once began to make concessions, this would set in motion the work of reformation, which, in all likelihood, would receive new accessions of vigour, and go on until a happy change were effected. This way of thinking might have led the Archbishop to give an indulgent reception to these proposals of *Du Pin*, which contained some concessions, and might be an introduction to more. And yet we find that Dr. Wake rejected this piece, as insufficient to serve as a basis, or ground-work, to the desired union. On receiving the piece, he immediately perceived that he had not sufficient ground for carrying on this negotiation, without previously consulting his brethren, and obtaining a permission from the King for this purpose. Besides this, he was resolved not to submit either to the direction of Dr. *Du Pin*, nor to that of the Sorbonne, in relation to what was to be retained, or what was to be given up, in the doctrine and discipline of the two churches; nor to treat with the church of Rome upon any other footing, than that of a perfect equality in point of authority and power. He declared more especially, that he would never comply with the proposals made in Dr. *Du Pin's Communionarium*, of which I have now given the contents; observing that, though he was a friend to peace, he was still more a friend to truth; and that, *unless the Roman Catholics gave up some of their doctrines and rites*, an union with them could never be effected. All this is contained in a letter written by the Archbishop to Mr. *Beauvoir*, on receiving *Du Pin's Communionarium*. This letter is dated August 30, 1718, and the reader will find a copy of it subjoined to this Appendix [n.] About a month after, his Grace wrote a letter to Dr. *Du Pin*, dated October 1, 1718, in which he complains of the tyranny of the Pope, exhorts the Gallican doctors to throw off the Papal yoke in a national council, since a general one is not to be expected; and declares, that this must be the great preliminary and fundamental principle of the projected union, which being settled, an uniformity might be brought about in other matters, or a diversity of sentiments mutually allowed, without any violation of peace or concord. The Archbishop commends, in the same letter, the candour and openness that reigns in the *Communionarium*; intreats Dr. *Du Pin* to write to him always upon the same footing, freely and without disguise and reserve; and tells him, he is pleased with several things in that piece, and with nothing more than with the Doctor's declaring it as his opinion, that there is not a great difference between their respective sentiments; but adds, that he cannot at present give his sentiments, at large, concerning that piece [o].

Dr. Wake seems to have aimed principally, in this correspondence, at bringing about a separation between the Gallican church and the court of

[n] See this Letter, N° III.

[o] See this Letter to *Du Pin*, N° V, as also the Archbishop's Letter to Dr. P. Piers de Girardin, N° VI.

APPEND. III.

Rome. The terms in which the French divines often spoke about the liberties of their church might give him some hope that this separation would take place, if ever these divines were countenanced by the civil power of France. But a man of the Archbishop's sagacity could not expect that they would enter into an union with any other national church *all at once*. He acted, therefore, with dignity, as well as with prudence, when he declined to explain himself on the proposals contained in *Du Pin's Communionarium*. To have answered ambiguously, would have been mean; and to have answered explicitly, would have blasted his hopes of separating them from Rome, which separation he desired upon the principles of civil and ecclesiastical liberty, independent on the discussion of theological tenets. The Archbishop's sentiments in this matter will still appear farther from the letters he wrote to Mr. *Beauvoir*, in the months of October, November, and December, 1718, and the January following, of which the proper extracts are here subjoined [p]. It appears from these letters, that Dr. *Wake* insisted still upon the abolition of the Pope's jurisdiction over the Gallican church, and leaving him no more than a *primacy of rank and honour, and that merely by ecclesiastical authority, as he was once Bishop of the Imperial City*; to which empty title our Prelate seems willing to have consented, provided it was attended with no infringement of the independency and privileges of each particular country and each particular church. *Si quam prærogativam* (says the Archbishop in his letter to Girardin [q], after having defied the court of Rome to produce any precept of Christ in favour of the primacy of its Bishop) *ecclesie concilia sedis imperialis episcopo concesserint (etsi cadente imperio etiam ea prærogativa excidisse merito possit censeari), tamen, quod ad me attinet, servatis semper regnorum juribus, ecclesiarum libertatibus, episcoporum dignitate, modo in cæteris conveniatur, per me licet, suo fruatur qualicumque Primatu: non ego illi locum primum, non inane honorem titulum invideo. At in alias ecclesias dominari, &c. hæc nec nos unquam ferre potuimus, nec vos debetis.*

It appears farther, from these letters, that any proposals or terms conceived by the Archbishop, in relation to this project of union, were of a vague and general nature, and that his views terminated rather in a plan of mutual toleration, than in a scheme for effectuating an intire uniformity. The scheme that seemed to his Grace the most likely to succeed was, that
 “ the independence of every national church on any other, and its right
 “ to determine all matters that arise within itself, should be acknowledged on
 “ both sides; that, for points of doctrine, they should agree, as far as possi-
 “ ble, in all articles of any moment (as in effect the two churches either
 “ already did, or easily might); and in other matters, that a difference
 “ should be allowed until God should bring them to an union in them
 “ also [r].” It must be, however, observed, though the expression is still general, that the Archbishop was for “ purging out of the publick offices of the
 “ church all such things as hinder a perfect communion in divine service, so
 “ that persons coming from one church to the other might join in prayers,

[p] See N^o IV, VII, VIII, IX, X. [q] See N^o VI. [r] See the pieces subjoined to this Appendix, N^o VIII.

“and the holy sacrament, and the publick service [r].” He was persuaded, APPEND. III. that, in the Liturgy of the Church of England, there was nothing, but what the Roman Catholics would adopt, except the single Rubric relating to the eucharist; and that in the Romish Liturgy there was nothing to which Protestants object, but what the more rational Romanists agree might be laid aside, and yet the publick offices be never the worse, or more imperfect, for the want of it. He therefore thought it proper to make the demands, already mentioned, the ground-work of the project of union, at the beginning of the negociation; not that he meant to stop here, but that, being thus far agreed, they might the more easily go farther, descend to particulars, and render their scheme more perfect by degrees [t].

The violent measures of the court of Rome against that part of the Gallican church which refused to admit the constitution *Unigenitus* as an ecclesiastical law, made the Archbishop imagine that it would be no difficult matter to bring this opposition to an open rupture; and to engage the persons concerned in it to throw off the Papal yoke, which seemed to be borne with impatience in France. The despotick bull of Clement XI, dated August 28, 1718, and which begins with the words, *Pastoralis officii*, was a formal act of excommunication thundered out against all the *Anti-constitutionists*, as the opposers of the bull *Unigenitus* were called, and it exasperated the doctors of the Sorbonne in the highest degree. It is to this that the Archbishop alludes, when he says, in his Letter to Mr. Beauvoir, dated the 23d of January, 1718, [u] “At present he (the Pope) has put them out of his communion. We have withdrawn ourselves from his; both are out of communion with him, and I think it is not material on which side the breach lies.” But the wished-for separation from the court of Rome, notwithstanding all the provocations of its Pontif, was still far off. Though, on numberless occasions, the French divines shewed very little respect for the Papal authority; yet the renouncing it altogether was a step, which required deep deliberation, and which, however inclined they might be to it, they could not make, if they were not seconded by the state. But from the state they were not likely to have any countenance. The Regent of France was governed by the Abbé Du Bois, and the Abbé Du Bois was aspiring eagerly after a Cardinal’s cap; this circumstance (not more unimportant than many secret connexions and trivial views that daily influence the course of publick events, the transactions of government, and the fate of nations) was sufficient to stop the Sorbonne and its doctors in the midst of their career; and, in effect, it contributed greatly to stop the correspondence of which I have been now giving an account, and to nip the project of union in the bud. The correspondence between the Archbishop and the two doctors of the Sorbonne, had been carried on with a high degree of secrecy; this secrecy was prudent, as neither of the corresponding parties was authorized by the civil powers to negotiate an union between the two churches [y]; and

[r] Ibid. id. [t] Ibid. id. [u] See the letters subjoined, N° X.

[y] Dr. Wake seems to have been sensible of the impropriety of carrying on a negociation of this nature without the approbation and countenance of government. “I have always (says he, in his Letter to Mr. Beauvoir, which the reader will find at the end of this appendix, Vol. III. F “ N°

APPEND.
III.

and on Dr. *Wake's* part, it was partly owing to his having nobody that he could trust with what he did; he was satisfied (as he says in a letter to Mr. *Beauvoir*) "that most of the High-church bishops and clergy would readily come into such a design; but these (adds his Grace) are not men either to be confided in, or made use of, by me [z]."

The correspondence, however, was divulged, and the project of union engrossed the whole conversation of the city of Paris. Lord *Stanhope* and Lord *Stair* were congratulated thereupon by some great personages in the Royal Palace. The Duke Regent himself, and Abbé *Du Bois*, minister of foreign affairs, and Mr. *Joli de Fleury*, the Attorney General, gave the line at first, appeared to favour the correspondence and the project, and let things run on to certain lengths. But the Jesuits and *Constitutioners* sounded the alarm, and overturned the whole scheme, by spreading a report, that Cardinal de Noailles and his friends, the Jansenists, were upon the point of making a coalition with the Hereticks. Hereupon the Regent was intimidated, and *Du Bois* had an opportunity of appearing a meritorious candidate for a place in the sacred college. Dr. *Piers Girardin* was sent for to court, was severely reprimanded by *Du Bois*, and strictly charged, upon pain of being sent to the Bastile, to give up all the letters he had received from the Archbishop of Canterbury, as also a copy of all his own. The Doctor was forced to obey; and all the letters were immediately sent to Rome, *as so many trophies* (says a certain author) *gained from the enemies of the church* [a]. The Archbishop's letters were greatly admired, as striking proofs, both of his catholick benevolence and extensive abilities.

Mr. *Beauvoir* informed the Archbishop, by a letter dated February 8, 1719, N. S. that Dr. *Du Pin* had been summoned, by the Abbé *Du Bois*, to give an account of what had passed between him and Dr. *Wake*. This step naturally suspended the correspondence, though the Archbishop was at a loss, at first, whether he should look upon it as favourable, or detrimental, to the projected union [b]. The letters which he wrote to Mr. *Beauvoir* and Dr. *Du Pin*, after this, express the same sentiments which he discovered through the whole of this transaction [c]. The letter to *Du Pin*, more especially, is full of a pacifick and reconciling spirit; and expresses the Archbishop's desire of cultivating fraternal charity with the Doctors, and his regret at the ill success of their endeavours towards the projected union. *Du Pin* died before this letter, which was retarded by some accident, arrived

"N^o XI) took it for granted, that no step should be taken towards an union, but with the knowledge, approbation, and even by the authority of civil powers.—All, therefore, that has passed hitherto, stands clear of any exception as to the civil magistrate. It is only a consultation, in order to find out a way how an union might be made, if a fit occasion should hereafter be offered."

[z] See the letters subjoined, N^o IX.

[a] These *trophies* were the defeat of the moderate part of the Gallican church, and the ruin of their project to break the Papal yoke and unite with the church of England. See above, note [b], page 23, where the conclusion which the author of the *Confessional* has drawn from this expression is shewn to be groundless.

[b] See his Letter to Mr. *Beauvoir*, in the pieces subjoined, N^o XI, dated February 5, 1718-19, O. S. that is, February 16, 1719, N. S.

[c] See *ibid.* N^o XI.—XVIII.

at Paris [d]. Before the Archbishop had heard of his death, he wrote to Mr. *Beauvoir*, to express his concern, that an account was going to be published of what had passed between the two Doctors and himself; and his hope, "that they would keep in generals, as the only way to renew the good design, if occasion should serve, and to prevent themselves trouble from the reflexions of their enemies," on account (as the Archbishop undoubtedly means) of the concessions they had made, which, though insufficient to satisfy true Protestants, were adapted to exasperate bigotted Papists. The Prelate adds, in the conclusion of this letter, "I shall be glad to know, that your Doctors still continue their good opinion of us. For, though we need not the approbation of men on our own account; yet I cannot but wish it as a means to bring them, if not to a perfect agreement in all things with us (which is not presently to be expected) yet to such an union, as may put an end to the odious charges against, and consequential aversion of, us, as hereticks and schismatics, and in truth make them cease to be so."

Dr. *Du Pin* (whom the Archbishop very sincerely lamented, as the only man, after Mr. *Ravechet*, on whom the hopes of a Reformation in France seemed to depend) left behind him an account of this famous correspondence. Some time before he died, he shewed it to Mr. *Beauvoir*, and told him that he intended to communicate it to a very great man (probably the Regent). Mr. *Beauvoir* observed to the Doctor, that one would be led to imagine, from the manner in which this account was drawn up, that the Archbishop made the first overtures with respect to the correspondence, and was the first who intimated his desire of the union; whereas it was palpably evident, that he (Dr. *Du Pin*) had first solicited the one and the other. *Du Pin* acknowledged this freely and candidly, and promised to rectify it, but was prevented by death.

It does not, however, appear that *Du Pin's* death put a final stop to the correspondence; for we learn by a letter from the Archbishop to Mr. *Beauvoir*, dated August 27, 1719, that Dr. *Piers Girardin* frequently wrote to his Grace. But the opportunity was past, the appellants from the bull *Unigenitus*, or the Anti-constitutionists, were divided; the court did not smile at all upon the project, because the Regent was afraid of the Spanish party and the Jesuits; and therefore the continuation of this correspondence after *Du Pin's* death was without effect.

Let the reader now, after having perused this historical account, judge of the appearance which Dr. *Wake* makes in this transaction. An impartial reader will certainly draw from this whole correspondence the following conclusions: that Archbishop *Wake* was invited to this correspondence by Dr. *Du Pin*, the most moderate of all the Roman Catholick divines;—that he entered into it with a view to improve one of the most favourable opportunities that could be offered, of withdrawing the church of France from the jurisdiction of the Pope, a circumstance, which must have immediately weakened the power of the court of Rome; and, in its consequences, offered a fair prospect of a farther Reformation in doctrine and worship, as the case happened in the church of England, when it happily threw off the Papal

[d] See his Letter to Mr. *Beauvoir*, N° XV.

APPEND.
III.

yoke ;—that he did not give *Du Pin*, or any of the Doctors of the Sorbonne, the smallest reason to hope, that the church of England would give up any one point of belief or practice to the church of France ; but insisted, on the contrary, that the latter should make alterations and concessions, in order to be reconciled to the former ;—that he never specified the particular alterations, which would be requisite to satisfy the rulers and doctors of the church of England ; but only expressed a general desire of an union between the two churches, if that were possible, or at least of a mutual toleration of each other ;—that he never flattered himself that this union could be perfectly accomplished, or that the Doctors of the Gallican church would be intirely brought over to the church of England ; but thought, that every advance made by them, and every concession, must have proved really advantageous to the Protestant cause.

The pacifick spirit of *Dr. Wake* did not only discover itself in his correspondence with the Romish Doctors, but in several other transactions in which he was engaged by his constant desire of promoting union and concord among Christians. For it is well known, that he kept up a constant friendly correspondence with the most eminent ministers of the foreign Protestant churches, and shewed a fraternal regard to them, notwithstanding the difference of their discipline and government from that of the church of England. In a letter written to the learned *Le Clerc*, in the year 1716, he expresses, in the most cordial terms, his affection for them, and declares positively, that nothing can be farther from his thoughts, than the notions adopted by certain bigoted and furious writers, who refuse to embrace the foreign Protestants as their brethren, will not allow their religious assemblies the denomination of *churches*, and deny the validity of their sacraments. He declares, on the contrary, these churches to be true *Christian churches*, and expresses a warm desire of their union with the church of England. It will be, perhaps, difficult to find, in any epistolary composition, ancient or modern, a more elegant simplicity, a more amiable spirit of meekness, moderation and charity, and a happier strain of that easy and unaffected politeness, which draws its expressions from a natural habit of goodness and humanity, than we meet with in this letter [e]. We see this active and benevolent Prelate still continuing to interest himself in the welfare of the Protestant churches abroad. In several letters, written in the years 1718 and 1719 to the pastors and professors of Geneva and Switzerland, who were then at variance about the doctrines of predestination and grace, and some other abstruse points of metaphysical theology, the Archbishop recommends earnestly to them a spirit of mutual toleration and forbearance, entreats them particularly to be *moderate* in their *demands* of subscription to *articles of faith*, and proposes to them the example of the church of England as worthy of imitation in this respect. In one of these letters, he exhorts the Doctors of Geneva not to go too far in explaining the *nature*, determining the *sense*, and imposing the *belief* of doctrines, which the Divine Wisdom has not thought proper to reveal *clearly* in the Holy Scriptures, and the ignorance of which is very consistent with a state of salvation ; and he recom-

[e] See an extract of it among the pieces subjoined, N^o XIX.

mends the prudence of the church of England, which has expressed these doctrines in such general terms, in its articles, that persons who think very differently about the doctrines, may subscribe the articles, without wounding their integrity [f]. His letters to Professor *Schurer* of Bern, and the excellent and learned *John Alfonso Turretin* of Geneva, are in the same strain of moderation and charity, and are here subjoined [g], as every way worthy of the reader's perusal. But what is more peculiarly worthy of attention here is a letter, written May 22, 1719 [h], to Mr. *Jablonski* of Poland, who, from a persuasion of Dr. *Wake's* great wisdom, discernment, and moderation, had proposed to him the following question: viz. *Whether it was lawful and expedient for the Lutherans to treat of an union with the church of Rome; or whether all negociations of this kind ought not to be looked upon as dangerous and delusive?* The Archbishop's answer to this question contains a happy mixture of Protestant zeal and Christian charity. He gives the strongest cautions to the Polish Lutherans against entering into any treaty of union with the Roman Catholics, otherwise than on a footing of perfect equality, and in consequence of a previous renunciation, on the part of the latter, of the tyranny, and even of the superiority and jurisdiction, of the church of Rome and its Pontif; and, as to what concerns points of doctrine, he exhorts them not to sacrifice truth to temporal advantages, or even to the desire of peace. It would carry us too far, were we to give a minute account of Dr. *Wake's* correspondence with the Protestants of *Nismes*, *Lithuania*, and other countries; it may, however, be affirmed, that no Prelate since the Reformation had so extensive a correspondence with the Protestants abroad, and none could have a more friendly one.

It does not appear, that the Dissenters in England made to the Archbishop any proposals, relative to an union with the established church; or that he made any proposals to them, on that head. The spirit of the times, and the situation of the contending parties, offered little prospect of success to any scheme of that nature. In Queen *Anne's* time, he was only Bishop of Lincoln; and the disposition of the House of Commons, and of all the Tory part of the nation, was then so unfavourable to the Dissenters, that it is not at all likely that any attempt towards re-uniting them to the established church would have passed into a law. And in the next reign, the face of things was so greatly changed in favour of the Dissenters, and their hopes of recovering the rights and privileges, of which they had been deprived, were so sanguine, that it may be well questioned whether they would have accepted the offer of an union, had it been made to them. Be that as it will, one thing is certain, and it is a proof of Archbishop *Wake's* moderate and pacifick spirit, and that is, that in the year 1714, when the spirit of the court and of the triumphant part of the ministry was, with respect to the Whigs in general, and to Dissenters in particular, a spirit of enmity and oppression, this worthy Prelate had the courage to stand up in opposition to the *Schism-bill*, and to protest against it as a hardship upon the Dissenters. This step, which must have blasted his credit at court, and proved detri-

[f] See the pieces here subjoined, N^o XX.

[g] See these letters, N^o XXI, XXII, XXIII.

[h] Ibid. N^o XXV.

APPEND. III. mental to his private interest, as matters then stood, shewed that his regard for the Dissenters was friendly and sincere. It is true, four years after this, when it was proposed to repeal the *Schism-bill* and the *Act against Occasional Conformity*, both at once, he disapproved of this proposal. And this circumstance has been alledged as an objection to the encomiums that have been given to his tender regard for the Dissenters, or, at least, as a proof that he changed his mind; and that *Wake*, Bishop of Lincoln, was more their friend, than *Wake*, Archbishop of Canterbury. I don't pretend to justify this change of conduct. It seems to have been, indeed, occasioned by a change of circumstances. The Dissenters, in their state of oppression during the ministry of *Bolingbroke* and his party, were objects of compassion; and those who had sagacity enough to perceive the ultimate object, which that ministry had in view, in oppressing them, must have interested themselves in their sufferings and opposed their oppressors, from a regard to the united causes of Protestantism and liberty. In the following reign, the credit of the Dissenters rose, and, while this encouraged the wise and moderate men among them to plead with prudence and with justice their right to be delivered from several real grievances, it elated the violent (and violent men there are in all parties, nay even in the cause of moderation) to a high degree. This rendered them formidable to all those who were jealous of the power, privileges, and authority of the established church, and Archbishop *Wake* was probably of this number. He had protested against the shackles, that were imposed upon them when they lay under the frowns of government; but apprehending, perhaps, that the removing these shackles in the day of prosperity, would render their motions towards power too rapid, he opposed the abrogation of the very acts, which he had before endeavoured to stifle in their birth. In this, however, it must be acknowledged, that the spirit of party mingled too much of its influence with the dictates of prudence; and that prudence, thus accompanied, was not very consistent with Dr. *Wake's* known principles of equity and moderation. As I was at a loss how to account for this part of the Archbishop's conduct, I addressed myself to a learned and worthy clergyman of the church of England, who gave me the following answer: "Archbishop *Wake's* objection to the Repeal of the Schism-act was founded on this consideration only, that such a repeal was needless, as no use had been made, or was likely to be made of that act. It is, also, highly probable, that he would have consented without hesitation to rescind it, had nothing farther been endeavoured at the same time. But, considering what sort of spirit was then shewn by the Dissenters and others, it ought not to be matter of great wonder, if he was afraid, that from the repeal of the other act, (*viz.* that against occasional conformity) considerable damage might follow to the church, over which he presided. And even supposing his fears to be excessive, or quite groundless, yet certainly they were pardonable in a man, who had never done, nor designed to do, any thing disagreeable to the Dissenters in any other affair, and, who, in this, had the concurrence of some of the greatest and wisest of the English Lords, and of the Earl of *Illy*, among the Scotch, though a professed Presbyterian." However

However some may judge of this particular incident, I think it will appear from the whole tenour of Archbishop WAKE's correspondence and transactions with Christian churches of different denominations, that he was a man of a pacifick, gentle, and benevolent spirit, and an enemy to the feuds, animosities, and party-prejudices, which divide the professors of one holy religion, and by which Christianity is exposed to the assaults of its virulent enemies, and wounded in the house of its pretended friends. To this deserved eulogy, we may add what a learned and worthy divine [i] has said of this eminent Prelate, considered as a controversial writer, even, that *his accurate and superior knowledge of the nature of the Romish hierarchy, and of the constitution of the church of England, furnished him with victorious arms, both for the subversion of error and the defence of truth.*

[i] Dr. WILLIAM RICHARDSON, Master of Emmanuel College in Cambridge, and Canon of Lincoln. See his noble edition and his very elegant and judicious continuation of Bishop GODWIN's *Commentarius de Præsulibus Anglicæ*, published in the year 1743, at Cambridge. His words (p. 167) are, *Nemo usquam ecclesiæ Romanæ vel Anglicanæ statum penitus cognitum et exploratum habuit; et proinde in disputandi arenam prodit tum ad oppugnandum, tum ad propugnandum instructissimus.*

AUTHENTIC

APPENDIXES TO MOSHEIM'S

AUTHENTICK COPIES of the ORIGINAL LETTERS, from which the preceding Account is drawn.

N^o I.

A Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Lambeth, Nov. 28th, S. V. 1717.

I AM indebted to you for several kind Letters, and some small Tracts, which I have had the Favour to receive from you. The last, which contains an Account of the new Edition that is going on of Chrysostome, I received yesterday. It will no doubt be a very valuable Edition; but, as they propose to go on with it, I shall hardly live to see it finished. They do not tell us, to whom here we may go for Subscriptions: and it is too much Trouble to make Returns to Paris. They should, for their own Advantage, say, where Subscriptions will be taken in London, and where one may call for the several Volumes as they come out, and pay for the next that are going on.

Among the Account of Books you were pleased to send me, there is one with a very promising Title, *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*, 5 Volumes: I wish I could know, what the chief of those Anecdotes are; it may be a Book very well worth having. I admire they do not disperse some Sheets of such Works. What they can add to make Moreri's Dictionary so very voluminous, I cannot imagine: I bought it in two exorbitant Volumes, and thought it big enough so. While I am writing this, Company is come in, so that I am forced to break off; and I can only assure you that upon all occasions you shall find me very sincerely,

Reverend Sir,

Your faithful Friend,

W. CANT.

N. B. This is the earliest Letter in the whole Collection: and, by the beginning of it, seems to be the first which the Archbishop wrote to Mr. Beauvoir.

N^o II.

A Letter from Mr. Beauvoir to Archbishop Wake.

My Lord,

Paris, 11 Dec. 1717, O. S.

I Had the honour of your Grace's Letter of the 28 ultimo but Sunday last; and therefore could not answer it sooner. A person is to be appointed to receive Subscriptions for the new Edition of St. Chrysostome, and deliver

deliver the Copies. Inclosed is an Account of the *Thesaurus Anecdotorum*. APPEND.
 Dr. Dupin, with whom I dined last Monday and with the Syndic of the Sor- III.
 bonne and two other Doctors, tells me, that what swells *Moreri's Dictionary*
 are several additions, and particularly the Families of Great Britain. He
 hath the chief hand in this new Edition. They talked as if the whole King-
 dom was to appeal to the future General Council, &c. They wished for
 an Union with the Church of England, as the most effectual means to unite
 all the Western Churches. Dr. Dupin desired me to give his duty to your
 Grace, upon my telling him, that I would send you an Arrest of the Parlia-
 ment of Paris relating to him, and a small Tract of his. I have transmitted
 them to Mr. Prevèreau at Mr. Secretary Addison's Office.

N^o III.

A Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Aug. 30, 1718.

I Told you in one of my last Letters, how little I expected from the pre-
 sent pretences of a Union with us. Since I received the papers you sent
 me, I am more convinced that I was not mistaken. My Task is pretty hard,
 and I scarce know how to manage myself in this matter. To go any farther
 than I have done in it, even as a Divine only of the Church of England,
 may meet with Censure: and as Archbishop of Canterbury, I cannot treat
 with these Gentlemen. I do not think my Character at all inferior to that
 of an Archbishop of Paris: On the contrary, without lessening the Autho-
 rity and Dignity of the Church of England, I must say it is in some respects
 superior. If the Cardinal were in earnest for such an Union, it would not
 be below him to treat with me himself about it. I should then have a suf-
 ficient Ground to consult with my Brethren, and to ask his Majesty's Leave
 to correspond with him concerning it. But to go on any farther with these
 Gentlemen, will only expose me to the Censure of doing what, in my station,
 ought not to be done without the King's knowledge; and it would be very
 odd for me to have an authoritative permission to treat with those who have
 no manner of authority to treat with me. However I shall venture at some
 Answer, or other, to both their Letters and Papers; and so have done with
 this affair.

I cannot well tell what to say to Dr. Du Pin: If he thinks we are to take
 their Direction what to retain, and what to give up, he is utterly mistaken.
 I am a Friend to Peace, but more to Truth. And they may depend upon
 it, I shall always account our Church to stand upon an equal Foot with
 their's; and that we are no more to receive Laws from them, than we de-
 sire to impose any upon them. In short: The Church of England is free,
 is orthodox: She has a plenary Authority within herself, and has no need
 to recur to any other Church to direct her what to retain, or what to do.
 Nor will we otherwise than in a brotherly way, and in a full Equality of
 Right and Power, ever consent to have any Treaty with that of France.
 And therefore, if they mean to deal with us, they must lay down this for

APPEND. the Foundation, That we are to deal with one another upon equal Terms.
III.

If, consistently with our own Establishment, we can agree upon a closer Union with one another, well: If not, we are as much, and upon as good Grounds, a free, independent Church as they are: and, for myself, as Archbishop of Canterbury, I have more power, larger privileges, and a greater Authority, than any of their Archbishops: From which, by the Grace of God, I will not depart, no not for the sake of a Union with them.

You see, Sir, what my sense of this matter is; and may perhaps think that I have a little altered my mind, since this affair was first set on foot. As to my desire of Peace and Union with all other Christian Churches, I am still the same: But with the Dr's Commonitorium I shall never comply. The matter must be put into another method; and whatever they think, they must alter some of their Doctrines, and Practices too, or a Union with them can never be effected. Of this, as soon as I have a little more Leisure, I shall write my mind as inoffensively as I can to them, but yet freely too.

If any thing is to come of this matter, it will be the shortest method I can take of accomplishing it, to put them in the right way. If nothing (as I believe nothing will be done in it), 'tis good to leave them under a plain Knowledge of what we think of ourselves and our Church: and to let them see, that we neither need, nor seek the Union proposed, but for their sake as well as our own; or rather neither for theirs nor ours; but in order to the promotion of a Catholic Communion (as far as is possible) among all the true Churches of Christ.

I have now plainly opened my mind to you: you will communicate no more of it than is fitting to the two Doctors, but keep it as a Testimony of my Sincerity in this affair; and that I have no design, but what is consistent with the Honour and Freedom of our English Church; and with the Security of that true and sound Doctrine which is taught in it; and from which no Consideration shall ever make me depart. I am,

Reverend Sir,

Your affectionate Friend

and Brother,

W. CANT.

N^o. IV.

From Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Oct. 8, 1718.

WHATEVER be the Consequence of our corresponding with the Sorbonne Doctors about matters of religion, the present Situation of our affairs plainly seems to make it necessary for us so to do. Under this apprehension I have written, tho' with great difficulty, two Letters to your two Doctors, which I have sent to the Secretaries office, to go with the next packet

pacquet to my Lord Stair. I beg you to enquire after them: They make up together a pretty thick packet, directed to you. In that to Dr. du Pin, I have in answer to two of his MSS. described the method of making Bishops in our Church. I believe he will be equally both pleased and surprized with it. I wish you could shew him the form of Consecration, as it stands in the End of your large Common-Prayer-Books. The rest of my Letters both to him and Doctor Piers, is a venture which I know not how they will take, to convince them of the necessity of embracing the present opportunity of breaking off from the Pope, and going one step farther than they have yet done, in their opinion of his Authority; so as to leave him only a primacy of place and honour; and that merely by Ecclesiastical Authority, as he was once Bishop of the Imperial City. I hope they both shew you my Letters: They are this time very long; and upon a nice point: I shall be very glad if you can any way learn how they take the freedom I have used, and what they really think of it. I cannot so much trust to their answers, in which they have more room to conceal their thoughts, and seldom want to overwhelm me with more compliments than I desire, or am well able to bear.

Pray do all you can to search out their real sense of, and motions at, the receipt of these two Letters; I shall thereby be able the better to judge how far I may venture hereafter to offer any thing to them upon the other Points in difference between us. Tho', after all, I still think, if ever a reformation be made, 'tis the State that must govern the Church in it. But this between ourselves.

N^o V.

A Letter from Archbishop Wake to Dr. Du Pin, dated October 1st, 1718.

*Speſtatiffimo Viro, Eruditorum ſuæ gentis, ſi non et ſui ſæculi principi;
D^{no} L. Ell. du Pin Doctori Pariſienſi,*

Gul. prov. div. Cant. Arch^{ie} in omnibus εὐφροεῖν καὶ εὐπράττειν.

DIU est, ampliffime Domine, ex quo debitor tibi factus sum ob plures tractatus MSS. quos tuo beneficio a dilecto mihi in Christo D. Beavoir accepi. Perlegi diligenter omnes, nec sine fructu: plurima quippe ab iis cognitu dignissima, vel primùm didici, vel clariùs intellexi: Beatamque his difficillimis temporibus censeo Ecclesiam Gallicanam, quæ talem sibi in promptu habeat Doctorem, in dubiis Consiliarium, in juribus suis tuendis Advocatum; qui et possit et audeat, non modo contra suos vel erroneos vel perfidos symystas dignitatem ejus tueri, sed et ipsi summo Pontifici (ut olim B. Apostolus Paulus Petro) in faciem resistere, quia reprehensibilis est. Atque utinam hæc quæ jam Romæ aguntur, tandem aliquando omnibus vobis animum darent ad Jura vestra penitus asserenda! Ut deinceps non ex Pragmaticis (ut olim) sanctionibus; non (ut hoc fere tempore) ex Concordatis; non ex præjudicatis hominum opinionibus res vestras agatis; sed eâ autoritate quâ decet Ecclesiam tam illustris ac præpotentis Imperii; quæ nullo jure, vel divino,

APPEND. III. vel humano, alteri olim aut Ecclesiæ aut Homini subjicitur; sed ipsa jus habet intra se sua negotia terminandi; et in omnibus sub Rege suo Christianissimo populum suum commissum propriis suis Legibus et Sanctionibus gubernandi.

Expergiscimini itaque, Viri eruditi; et quod Ratio postulat, nec refragatur Religio, strenue agite. Hoc bonorum subditorum erga Regem suum Officium, Christianorum erga Episcopos suos, heu! nimium extraneorum Tyrannide oppressos, Pietas exigit, flagitat, requirit. Excutite tandem jugum istud, quod nec Patres vestri, nec Vos ferre potuistis. Hic ad Reformationem non prætenfam, sed veram, sed justam, sed necessariam Ecclesiæ nostræ primus fuit gradus. Quæ Cæsaris erant, Cæsari reddidimus; quæ Dei, Deo. Coronæ Imperiali Regni nostri suum Suprematum, Episcopatui suam ἀξίαν, Ecclesiæ suam Libertatem restituit, vel eo solùm nomine semper cum honore memorandus, Rex Henricus VIII. Hæc omnia sub pedibus conculcaverat idem ille tunc Nobis, qui jam Vobis inimicus. Sæpius autoritas Papalis intra certos fines legibus nostris antea fuerat coercita; et iis quidem legibus, quas siquis hodie inspiceret, impossibile ei videretur eas potuisse aliquâ vel vi vel astutiâ perrumpere. Sed idem nobis accidit quod illis, qui Dæmoniacum vinculis ligare voluere. Omnia frustra tentata: Nihil perfecere inania legum repagula, contra nescio quos prætextus potestatis divinæ nullis humanis constitutionibus subditæ. Tandem defatigato regno dura necessitas sua jura tuendi oculos omnium aperuit. Proponitur quæstio Episcopis ac Clero in utriusque provinciæ synodo congregatis, an Episcopus Romanus in Sacris Scripturis habeat aliquam majorem jurisdictionem in regno Angliæ quàm quisvis alius externus Episcopus? In partem sanam, justam, veram utriusque Concilii suffragia concurrere. Quod Episcopi cum suo Clero statuerant, etiam Regni Academiæ calculo suo approbârunt, Rex cum Parlamento fancivit: Adeoque tandem, quod unicè fieri poterat, sublata penitus potestas, quam nullæ leges, nulla jura, vel Civilia vel Ecclesiastica, intra debitos fines unquam poterant continere. En nobis promptum ac paratum exemplum; quod sequi vobis gloriosum, nec minus posteris vestris utile fuerit! Quo solo pacem, absque veritatis dispendio, tueri valeatis; ac irridere bruta de Vaticano fulmina; quæ jamdudum ostenditis vobis non ultra terrori esse, utpote a Sacris Scripturis edoctis, quod *maledictio absque causâ prolata non superveniet*. Prov. xxvi. 2.

State ergo in libertate quâ Christus vos donaverit: Frustra ad Concilium generale nunquam convocandum res vestras refertis. Frustra Decretorum vim suspendere curatis, quæ ab initio injusta, erronea, ac absurda ac plane nulla erant. Non talibus subsidiis vobis opus est. Regiâ permissione, Autoritate suâ a Christo commissâ, Archiepiscopi et Episcopi vestri in Concilium Nationale coeant: Academiarum, Cleri, ac præcipue utrorumque principis Theologicæ Facultatis Parisiensis consilium atque auxilium sibi assumant: Sic muniti quod æquum et justum fuerit decernant: Quod decreverint etiam civili autoritate firmandum curent: Nec patientur factiosos homines aliò res vestras vocare, aut ad Judicem appellare qui nullam in Vos autoritatem exposcere debeat, aut si exposcat, meritò a vobis recusari et poterit et debuerit.

Ignoscas,

Ignoscas, Vir πολυμαθήςατε, indignationi dicam an amoris meo, si forte aliquando ultra modum commoveri videar ab iis quæ vobis his proximis annis acciderint. Veritatem Christi omni quâ possum animi devotione colo. Hanc Vos tuemini: pro hac censuras Pontificias subiistis, et porro ferre parati estis.

APPEND.
III.

Ille, qui se pro summo ac ferè unico Christi vicario venditat, veritatem ejus sub pedibus proterit, conculcat. Justitiam veneror: Ac proinde Vos injustè, ac planè tyrannicè, si non oppressos, at impetitos, at comminatos; at ideo non solum non penitus obrutos, subversos, prostratos, quia Deus furori ejus obicem posuit, nec permiserit vos in ipsius manus incidere; non possum non vindicare, et contra violentum oppressorem, meum qualecunque suffragium ferre.

Jura ac Libertates inclyti regni, celeberrimæ ecclesiæ, præstantissimi cleri cum honore intueor. Hæc Papa reprobatur, contemnit: Et dum sic alios tractat, merito se aliis castigandum, certe intra justos fines coercendum, exhibet. Siquid ei potestatis supra alios Episcopos Christus commiserit, proferantur tabulæ, jus evincatur; cedere non recusamus.

Siquam prærogativam Ecclesiæ Concilia sedis Imperialis Episcopo concesserint (et si cadente Imperio, etiam eâ prærogativâ excidisse merito possit censei); tamen quod ad me attinet, servatis semper regnorum juribus, ecclesiarum libertatibus, episcoporum dignitate, modo in cæteris conveniatur, per me licet, suo fruatur qualicumque primatu: non ego illi locum primum; non inanem honoris titulum invideo. At in alias ecclesias dominari; Episcopatum, cujus partem Christus unicuique Episcopo in solidum reliquit, tantum non in solidum sibi soli vindicare; si quis ejus injustæ Tyrannidi sese opposuerit, cælum ac terram in illius perniciem commovere; Hæc nec nos unquam ferre potuimus, nec Vos debetis. In hoc pacis fundamento si inter nos semel conveniatur, in cæteris aut idem sentiemus omnes, aut facilè alii aliis dissentienti libertatem absque pacis jacturâ concedemus.

Sed abripit calamum meum nescio quis Ευθυσιασμός, dum de vestris injuriis nimium sum sollicitus, et forte liberius quàm par esset, de his rebus ad te scripsisse videbor.

Ego verò uti ea omnia, quæ Tu in tuo Commonitorio exaraveris, etiam illa in quibus ab invicem dissentimus, grato animo accipio; ita ut apertè, ut candidè, et absque omni furore porro ad me scribere pergas, eaque παρρησία quâ amicum cum amico agere deceat, imprimis a te peto; eo te mihi amicior fore existimans, quo simplicius, quo planius, quicquid senseris, liberè dixeris.

Nec de Commonitorio tuo amplius aliquid hoc tempore reponam: In quo cum plurima placeant, tum id imprimis, quod etiam tuo judicio, non adeo longe ab invicem distemus, quin si de fraternâ unione ineundâ publicâ aliquando autoritate deliberari contigerit, via facile inveniri poterit ad pacem inter nos stabiliendam, salvâ utrinque Ecclesiæ Catholicæ fide ac veritate.

Quod ad alteros tuos tractatus de Constitutione Episcoporum in Ecclesiis vacantibus, siquidem Papa legitimè requisitus, facultates suas personis a Rege nominatis obstinate pernegaverit; in iis sane reperio quod non tuâ eruditione

et

APPEND. et iudicio sit. Quare ne prorsus ἀσύμβολος discedam, ordinem tibi breviter
III. delineabo constituendi episcopos in hac Reformatâ nostrâ Ecclesiâ.

Tu iudicabis, an aliquid magis canonicè vel excogitari vel statui poterit.

N° VI.

A Letter from Archbishop Wake to Dr. P. Piers Girardin, written in
October 1718.

Præstantissimo Viro, Consummatissimo Theologo, D^{no} Patricio Piers de Girardin, sacrae facultatis Parisiensis Theologiae Doctori,

Gul. prov. div. Cant. Arch. Gratiam, Pacem, ac Salutem in Domino.

POST prolixiores epistolas eruditissimo confratri tuo, D^{no} Drⁱ Du Pin hoc ipso tempore exaratas; quasque ego paulo minùs tuas, quàm illius existimari velim, facilius a te veniam impetrabo, vir spectatissime, si aliquanto brevius ad te rescribam; et in illis quidem animi mei vel amoris vel indignationi liberè indulsi: eâque simplicitate, quâ decet Christianum et maxime episcopum, quid vobis, meâ saltem sententiâ, factu opus sit, apertè exposui. Siquid, vel tuo vel illius iudicio, asperius quàm par esset a me exciderit, cum vestri causâ adeo commotus fuerim, facile id homini tam benevolè erga vos animato, uti spero, condonabitur: Unaque reminiscimini, nullam unquam vobis stabilem inter vos pacem, aut catholicam cum aliis unionem, haberi posse, dum aliquid ultrâ merum honoris primatum ac προεδρίαν Pontifici Romano tribuitis. Hoc nos per aliquot sæcula experti sumus; vos jam sentire debetis, qui, nescio quo infano ipsius beneficio, adeo commodam occasionem nacti estis, non tam ab illius decretis appellandi, quàm ab ipsius dominio ac potestate vos penitus subducendi. Ipse vos pro-Schismaticis habet; qualem vos eum censere debetis. Ipse a vestrà communione se suosque separandos publicè denunciat. Quid vobis in hoc casu faciendum? Liceat mihi veteris illius Cæsareæ Episcopi Firmiliani verbis respondere; sic olim Stephanum Papam acriter quidem, sed non ideo minus iuste, castigavit: *Vide quâ imperitiâ reprehendere audeas eos qui contra mendacium pro veritate nituntur.—Peccatum verò quàm magnum tibi exaggerasti, quando te a tot gregibus scidisti: excidisti enim te ipsum, noli te fallere: Siquidem ille est vere Schismaticus, qui se a communione ecclesiasticâ unitatis apostatam fecerit. Dum enim putas omnes a te abstinere posse, solum te ab omnibus abstinuisti.* Cypr. Op. Epist. 75.

Agite ergo, Viri eruditi, et quo vos divina providentia vocat, libenter sequimini. Clemens Papa vos abdicavit; a suâ et suorum communione repulit, reiecit. Vos illius authoritati renuntiate. Cathedræ Petri, quæ in omnibus catholicis ecclesiis conservatur, adhærete: Etiam nostram ne refugiatis communionem; quibuscum si non in omnibus omnino doctrinæ Christianæ capitibus conveniatis, at in præcipuis, at in fundamentalibus, at in omnibus Articulis fidei ad salutem necessariis plane consentitis; etiam in cæteris, uti speramus, brevi consensuri. Nobis certe eo minus vos vel Hæreticos vel Schismaticos fore confidite, quòd a Papâ ejecti pro Hæreticis et Schismaticis Romæ aestimemini. Sed contrahenda vela, nec indulgendum huic meo pro
I vobis

vobis zelo; etsi sit secundum scientiam. Prudentibus loquor; Vos ipsi, quod APPEND.
dico, judicate. III.

Ad literas tuas, præstantissime Domine, redeo: In quibus uti tuum de mediocritate meâ judicium, magis ex affectu erga me tuo, quàm secundum merita mea prolatum, gratanter accipio, ita in eo te nunquam falli patiar, quod me pacis Ecclesiasticæ amantissimum credas; omniaque illi consequendæ danda putem, præter veritatem. Quantum ad illam promovendam tu jam-jam contuleris, ex sex illis propositionibus quas tuis inseruisti literis, gratus agnosco: Ac nisi ambitiose magis quàm hominem privatum deceat, me facturum existimarem, etiam eruditissimis illis confratribus tuis Doctoribus Sorbonicis, quibus priores meas literas communicâsti, easdem per te gratias referrem. Sane Facultas vestra Parisiensis, uti maximum in his rebus pondus meritò habere debeat, siue numerum, siue dignitatem, siue denique eruditionem suorum membrorum spectemus; ita a vobis exordium sumere debebit unio illa inter nos tantopere desiderata, siquidem eam aliquando iniri voluerit Deus.

Interim gratulor vobis post illustrissimum Card. Noaillium, alterum illud Ecclesiæ Gallicanæ, fidei Catholicæ Columnam et Ornamentum, procuratorem regium, D. D. De Joly de Fleury. Quem virum ego non jam primum ex tuis literis debito prosequi honore didici, verum etiam ob ea quæ vestri causâ his proximis annis publice egerit, antea suspicere, et pene venerari, consueveram. Sub his ducibus, quid non sperandum in publicum vestrum ac Catholicæ Ecclesiæ commodum? Intonet de Vaticano Pontifex Rom. fremant inter vos ipsos conjurata turba, Romanæ curiæ servi magis quàm suæ Galliæ fideles subditi. His præfidiis ab eorum injuriis tuti, vanas eorum iras contemnere valeatis.

Ego vero, uti omnia vobis publicè fausta ac felicia precor, ita Tibi, spectatissime vir, me semper addictissimum fore promitto. De quo quicquid aliàs senseris, id saltem ut de me credas jure postulo; me sincerè veritatem Christi et amare et quærere; et, nisi omnino me fallat animus, etiam affecutum esse. Nulli Christiano inimicus antehac aut fui aut deinceps sum futurus: Sic de erroribus eorum, qui a me dissident, judico, ut semper errantes Deo judicandos relinquam. Homo sum, errare possum; sic verò animatus audacter dicam, Hæreticus esse nolo. Te verò, siquidem id permittas, Fratrem; sin id minus placeat, saltem id indulgebis, ut me verè et ex animo profitear, excellentissime Domine, Tui amantissimum,

W. C.

Nº VII.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop *Wake* to Mr. *Beauvoir*.

Nov^r: 6, O. S. 1718.

YOUR last Letter gives me some Trouble, but more Curiosity. I little thought, when I wrote to your two Doctors, that my Letters should have been read, much less Copies of them given, to any such great persons as you mention. I write in haste, as you know, and trust no Amanuensis to
copy

APPEND.
III.

copy for me, because I will not be liable to be betrayed. And upon a review of my foul and only Copy of them, since I had your Account from Paris, I find some things might have been more accurately expressed, had I took more time to correct my stile. But I wish that be the worst Exception against them: I fear the freedom I took in exhorting them to do somewhat in earnest, upon so fair a provocation, with regard to the Papal Authority, tho' excused as well as I could, will hardly go down so effectually as I could wish with them. This raises my Curiosity to know truly and expressly how that part of my Letters operated on both your Doctors; which, by a wary observation, you may in good measure gather from their Discourse. I cannot tell whether they shewed my Letters to you; if they did, I am sure you will think I did not mince the matter with them in that particular.

Of your two Doctors, Dr. Piers seems the more polite: He writes elegantly both for stile and matter; and has the freer air, even as to the business of a Union. Yet I do not despair of Dr. Du Pin; whom 30 years ago, in his collection of Tracts relating to Church Discipline, I did not think far from the Kingdom of God.

N^o VIII.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop *Wake* to Mr. *Beauvoir*.

Nov^r. 18, 1718.

AT present my more particular Curiosity leads me to know the Sentiments of the leading Men in France with regard to the Court of Rome; from which if we could once divide the Gallican Church, a Reformation in other Matters would follow of Course. The scheme that seems to me most likely to prevail, is, to agree in the Independence (as to all Matters of Authority) of every National Church on any others; and in their right to determine all matters that arise within themselves; and for points of doctrine, to agree as far as possible in all articles of any moment (as in effect we either already do, or easily may): and for other Matters, to allow a Difference, 'till God shall bring us to a Union in those also.—One only thing should be provided for, to purge out of the public offices of the Church such things as hinder a perfect communion in the Service of the Church, that so whenever any come from Us to Them, or from Them to Us, we may all join together in Prayers and the Holy Sacraments with each other. In our Liturgy there is nothing but what they allow of, save the single Rubric relating to the Eucharist; In theirs nothing but what they agree may be laid aside, and yet the public offices be never the worse, or more imperfect for want of it. Such a Scheme as this, I take to be a more proper ground of Peace, at the Beginning, than to go to more particulars: If in such a foundation we could once agree, the rest would more easily be built upon it. If you find occasion, and that it may be of use, you may extract this Project, and offer it to their Consideration, as what you take to be my Sense in the Beginning of a Treaty. Not that I think we shall stop here; but that being thus far agreed, we shall the more easily go into a greater perfection hereafter. I desire you to ob-

serve,

serve, as much as you can, when it is I may the most properly write to the APPEND. III.
Doctors. I took the subject of the Pope's Authority in my last, as arising naturally from the present state of their affairs, and as the first thing to be settled in order to a Union. How my Freedom in that respect has been received, I desire you freely to communicate.

N^o IX.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Dec^r. 2, O. S. 1718.

I AM glad the two Doctors seem to receive my last Letters so well. The truth is, that while they manage as they do, with the Court of Rome, nothing will be done to any purpose. And all ends in trifling at the last. We honestly deny the Pope all Authority over Us: They pretend in words to allow him so much as is consistent with what they call their Gallican Privileges: But let him never so little use it contrary to their good liking, they protest against it; appeal to a general Council; and then mind him as little as we can do. In earnest, I think we treat his Holiness not only with more sincerity, but more respect than they. For to own a Power, and yet keep a reserve to obey that Power only so far, and in such cases, as we make ourselves Judges of; is a greater affront than honestly to confess that we deny the Power, and for that reason refuse to obey it. But my Design was partly to bring them to this; and partly to see how they would bear, at least the proposal, of totally breaking off from the Court, and Bishop of Rome.

What you can observe, or discover, more, of their inclinations in this particular, will be of good use: Especially if it could be found out what the Court would do, and how far that may be likely to countenance the Clergy in such a separation. In the mean time, it cannot be amiss to cultivate a Friendship with the leading Men of that side; who may in time be made use of to the good work of reforming in earnest the Gallican Church. I am a little unhappy that I have none here I yet dare trust with what I do; tho' I am satisfied most of our High-Church Bishops and Clergy would readily come into such a Design. But these are not men either to be confided in, or made use of, by

Your assured Friend

W. CANT.

P. S. Did Cardinal de Noailles know what Authority the Archbishop of Canterbury has got by the Reformation; and how much a greater man he is now, than when he was the Pope's Legatus Natus; it might encourage him to follow so good a pattern, and be assured (in that case) he would lose nothing by sending back his Cardinal's Cap to Rome. I doubt your Doctors know little of these matters.

APPENDIXES TO MOSHEIM'S

N° X.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop *Wake* to Mr. *Beauvoir*.

Jan. 23, O. S. 1718.

WHEN you see my Letter (for I conclude the Doctor will shew it you) you may do well to bring on the Discourse of our Episcopal Rights and Privileges in England; and particularly of the Prerogatives of the Archbishop of Canterbury, which I believe are greater than those of the Archbishop of Rheims, or of all the Archbishops in France. This may raise in them a Curiosity to know more of this Matter; which if they desire, I will take the first little leisure I have to give them a more particular account of it. We must deal with Men in their own way, if we mean to do any good with them. They have been used to a pompous Ministry, and, like the Jews heretofore, would despise the Messiah himself, if he should come in a poor and low Estate to them. And therefore, tho' for myself, I account all temporal Grandeur as nothing; nay am afraid it has rather hurt the Church of Christ, and the true spirit of Piety and Religion, than done any real service to either; yet it may be a means of disposing these Gentlemen to a more favourable thought of, and inclination towards, a Reformation; to convince them that they return to the Truth of Christianity, and leave the Corruptions of Rome, without losing any Honour, any Power, that a Servant of Christ would desire to be troubled withal. Had the first Reformers in France yielded to this Scheme, as we in England shewed them an Example, the whole Gallican Church had come in to them, and been at this Day as we are now: We must therefore hit off the blot which they made; and satisfy their Ambition so far as to shew them, that they may reform, without giving up either their Authority or Revenues; and be still as great, but much better Bishops, under our circumstances, than under their own.

As to the Pope's Authority, I take the difference to be only this; that we may all agree (without troubling ourselves with the reason) to allow him a primacy of order in the Episcopal College; they would have it thought necessary to hold Communion with him, and allow him a little canonical Authority over them, as long as he will leave them to prescribe the bounds of it: We fairly say we know of no Authority he has in our Realm; but for actual Submission to him, they as little mind it as we do.

At present he has put them out of his Communion; we have withdrawn ourselves from his; both are out of Communion with him, and I think 'tis not material on which side the breach lies.

N° XI.

A Letter from Archbishop *Wake* to Mr. *Beauvoir*.

Feb. 5, 1718-19, O. S.

I DO not doubt but that mine of the 18th of January, with the two inclosed for my Lord Stair and Dr. Du Pin, are before this come safe to you. I should not be sorry if, upon this late transaction between the Doctor

and Ministry, you have kept it in your hands, and not delivered it to him. APPEND. III.
 I had just begun a letter to Dr. Piers, but have thrown aside what I writ of it, since I received your last, and must beg the favour of you to make my excuse to him, with the tenders of my hearty service, till I see a little more what the meaning of this present inquisition is. I am not so unacquainted with the finesses of courts, as not to apprehend, that what is now done, may be as well in favour of the Doctor's attempt as against it. If the Procureur General be indeed well affected to it, he might take this Method, not only to his own Security, but to bring the affair under a deliberation, and give a handle to those, whom it chiefly concerns, to discover their sentiments of it. But the matter may be also put to another use, and nobody can answer that it shall not be so: and till I see what is the meaning of this sudden turn, I shall write no more letters for the French Ministry to examine, but content myself to have done enough already to men, who cannot keep their own counsel, and live in a country where even the private correspondence of learned men with one another, must be brought to a public enquiry, and be made the subject of a state inquisition. I am not aware that in any of my letters there is one line that can give a just offence to the Court. I have always took it for granted, that no step should be taken towards a Union, but with the knowledge and approbation, and even by the authority, of civil powers: and, indeed, if I am in the right, that nothing can be done to any purpose in this case, but by throwing off the Pope's authority, as the first step to be made in order to it; 'tis impossible for any such attempt to be made by any power less than the King's. All therefore that has passed hitherto stands clear of any just exception as to the Civil Magistrate: it is only a consultation, in order to find out a way how a Union might be made, if a fit occasion should hereafter be offered for the doing of it. Yet still I do not like to have my letters exposed in such a manner, tho' satisfied there is nothing to be excepted against in them; and think I shall be kind to the Doctors themselves, to suspend, at least for a while, my farther troubling of them. I hope you will endeavour, by some or other of your friends, to find out the meaning of this motion; from whom it came; how far it has gone; what was the occasion of it; and what is like to be the consequence of it; what the Abbé Du Bois says of my Letters, and how they are received by him and the other ministers. I shall soon discover whether any notice has been taken of it to our ministry; and I should think if the Abbé spoke to your Lord about it, he would acquaint you with it.

N^o XII.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Feb. 24, 1718.

I DO not at all wonder that the Cardinals Rohan and Bissi should do all they can to blacken the good Cardinal de Noailles, and in him the party of the Anti-Constitutionists, but especially the Sorbonne, their most weighty and learned adversaries: and I am sensible that such a complaint is not only

APPEND.
III.

the most proper to do this, but to put the Court itself under some difficulties, which way soever it acts upon it. But I am still the more curious to learn, if it were possible, not only the proceedings of the ministry above-board hereupon, but their private thoughts and opinions about it. I am under no concern upon my own account, farther than that I would be unwilling to have my Letters scanned by so many great men, which will scarcely bear the judgment of my very friends. You must do me the favour to get out of your Doctors what will be most obliging to them; whether to continue to write to them, or to be silent for a while, till we see what will be the effect of this enquiry. In the mean time, it grows every day plainer, what I said from the beginning, that no Reformation can be made but by the authority, and with the concurrence, of the Court; and that all we Divines have to do, is to use our interest to gain them to it, and to have a plan ready to offer to them, if they should be prevailed upon to come to it.

I am at present engaged in two or three other transactions of moment to the foreign Protestants, which take up abundance of my time; God knows what will be the effect of it. Nevertheless, if I can any way help to promote this, tho' I am at present without any help, alone, in this project, I shall do my utmost, both to keep up my poor little interest with the two Doctors, and their friends, and to concert proper methods with them about it. The surest way will be, to begin as well, and to go as far as we can, in settling a friendly correspondence one with another: to agree to own each other as true brethren, and members of the Catholic Christian Church: to agree to communicate in every thing we can with one another (which, on their side, is very easy, there being nothing in our offices, in any degree, contrary to their own principles); and would they purge out of theirs what is contrary to ours, we might join in the public service with them; and yet leave one another in the free liberty of believing Transubstantiation or not, so long as we did not require any thing to be done by either, in pursuance of that opinion. The Lutherans do this very thing; many of them communicate not only in Prayers, but the Communion with us; and we never enquire whether they believe Consubstantiation, or even pay any worship to Christ as present with the elements, so long as their outward actions are the same with our own, and they give no offence to any with their opinions.

P. S. Since this last accident, and the public noise of an Union at Paris, I have spoken something more of it to my friends here, who I begin to hope will fall in with it. I own a correspondence, but say not a tittle how far, or in what way, I have proceeded, more than that letters have passed, which can no longer be a secret. I have never shewn one of my own or the Doctor's to any body.

N° XIII.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop *Wake* to Mr. *Beauvoir*.

March 16, S. V. 1718.

I Thank you for your account of what passed between Mons^r. Hop and you, relating to the project of an Union: I doubt that gentleman will not be pleased with it; because, indeed, the Gallican Church will never unite with any church that has not an orderly Episcopacy in it. I am very sorry my poor Letters are made so public: the next thing will be, that either the imprudence of our friends, or the malice of our enemies, will print them; and then I shall have censures enough for them, perhaps some reflections printed upon them, or answers made to them; but this shall not engage me in any defence of them, or in taking any farther notice of them. I beg you to keep those I have written to yourself from all view; for I have no copies of them, and I wrote them as I do my other ordinary letters, without any great thought or consideration, more than what my subject (as I was writing) led me in that instant to. This is the liberty to be taken with a friend, where one is sure what he writes shall go no farther; but, for the same reason, will require the strictest suppression from any other view. I cannot yet guess what this turn means, nor how it will end: I wish your Doctors could give you some farther light into it.

P. S. I intreat you never to forget me to the two good Doctors, whom I love and honour: keep up the little interest I have with them. As soon as ever the present turn is over, I will write to Dr. Girardin. I hope my Letters will not always be carried as criminals before the Secretary of State, tho' I am persuaded he bears no ill-will to me.

N° XIV.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop *Wake* to Mr. *Beauvoir*.

April 29, 1718.

I AM much concerned to hear that Dr. Du Pin decays so fast: I feared, by his last letter, that he was sinking a-pace. Pray, is there any good print of him taken these last years? for I have one that was made when he was a young man. I am sorry Dr. Piers grows faint-hearted: I never thought any thing could be done as to a Reformation in France, without the authority of the Court; but I was in hopes the Regent and others might have found their account in such an attempt; and then the good disposition of the Bishops, Clergy, and Sorbonne, with the Parliament of Paris, would have given a great deal of spirit and expedition to it. I have done what was proper for me in that matter: I can now go no farther, till the Abbot Du Bois is better disposed; yet I shall still be pleased to keep up a little esteem between those gentlemen, which will do *us* some good, if it does not do *them* any

APPEND. any service. I am apt to think, the good old man (Du Pin) does not think
 III. us far from the Kingdom of Heaven. I have with this sent a letter of friendship to Dr. Piers, which you will be so kind as to send him, with my kind respects.

N° XV.

Extract from a Letter of Archbishop Wake to M. Du Pin, dated Lambeth,
 May 1, 1719.

(N. B. Du Pin was dead before it arrived at Paris.)

SPERAVERAM equidem tua auctoritate, constantiâ, eruditione, pietate, moderatione, quæ omnia adeo in te perfecta esse noscuntur, ut vix in aliis singula, præclari aliquid ad Dei gloriam, Ecclesiæque Gallicanæ utilitatem perfici potuisse. Crediderim advenisse tempus, in quo, excusso Romanæ Tyrannidis jugo, una nobiscum in eandem communionem coalesceretis. In dogmatibus, prout a te candide proponuntur, non admodum dissentimus: in regimine Ecclesiastico minus: in fundamentalibus, sive doctrinam sive disciplinam spectemus, vix omnino. Quam facilis erat ab his initiis ad concordiam progressus, modo animos haberemus ad pacem compositos! Sed hoc principibus seculi non aridet, Unionis inimicis etiam plurimum displicet: neque nobis forte dabit Deus esse tam felicibus, ut ad hujusmodi Unionem nostram qualemcunque operam conferamus. Relinquamus hoc Illi, in cujus manu sunt rerum omnium tempora & occasiones. Sufficiat voluisse aliquid in tam insigni opere, forte & semina in terram projecisse, quæ fructum tandem multiplicem proferant. Interim, quod nemo nobis denegare possit, nos invicem ut fratres, ut ejusdem mystici corporis membra, amplectamur.

N° XVI.

Extract of a Letter from Archbishop Wake to Mr. Beauvoir.

Feb. 9, S. V. 1719-20.

I Heartily wish there were either spirit or inclination enough in the Sorbonne to go on with our friend the Abbé's project; but the fire decays, men's inclinations cool; the Court will do nothing, and you are very sensible that without the Court nothing can be done in any such affair. Nevertheless, their good opinion of the Church of England should be kept up as much possible; we should encourage them all we can to account of us as of brethren, who have only thrown off, what they are weary of, the tyranny of the Court of Rome, without any change in any fundamental article, either of the doctrine or government of the Catholic Church. And upon this ground I shall be ready to continue a brotherly correspondence with any of their great men, provided it be done with such caution as may not expose my Letters to be made prisoners to a Secretary of State, a thing which can never become my character, and may carry an ill aspect, even in our own Court, till the thing be rightly understood.

N° XVII.

N^o XVII.Extract of a Letter from the Archbishop to Mr. *Beauvoir*.

March 31, 1720.

I Thank you for your account of the present state of the French Church. It is a very odd one indeed; but will settle into an agreement at last: when once the appellants begin to break, the Court will drive all the Ob-
stinate (as they will call them; I should name them, the Honest Men, of
Courage and Constancy) to a compliance.

N^o XVIII.Extract of a Letter from the Archbishop to Mr. *Beauvoir*.

April 19, O. S. 1720.

I Perceive, by some late letters from him [Piers Girardin], that he begins to despair of the business of the Constitution. He has reason: the Cardinal de Noailles is ensnared, and has gone too far to retire. The new Archbishop of Cambray will be a Cardinal, and this affair of the Constitution must procure the Calot for him. The Regent himself is afraid of the Spanish party, and the Jesuits; and he will gain, or at least appease them. For all these reasons, the doctrine of the Church, and the Gallican Liberties, must be abandoned; and on the slight pretence of a comm^t. of no esteem with the opposite party, an accommodation will certainly be made; and those who will not voluntarily go, shall be driven into it. If our poor Friend be one of those who must hereby suffer, why may he not consider of a retreat hither? and since he cannot yet bring on an Union with the two Churches, unite himself with ours, from which I am sure his principles, and I believe his inclinations, are not greatly distant? But this must be managed very tenderly, and rather by a kind of rallying, than a direct proposal of it. If he inclines to it, he will easily understand your meaning; if not, 'tis best not to go on far with him, in a matter in which you will have no good success.

N^o XIX.Extract of a Letter from Archbishop *Wake* to Mr. *Le Clerc*, April 1719.

NOVUM Testamentum Gallicum, notis tuis feliciter ornatum, totum, nec sine fructu, perlegi. Præfatione tuâ eidem præfixâ mirifice affectus sum; legi, relegi, quin et sæpius deinceps repetam. Ita me in ipso præsertim ejus initio commovit, ut veræ pietatis in eâ relucens spiritum nunquam satis laudare possim, vel animo meo satis altè imprimere.

Et quamvis in Annotationibus tuis quædam liberiùs dicta occurrant, quæ non æque omnibus placeant, neque mihi ipsi ubique satisfaciant; fero tamen, et vel in ipso tuo a communi sententiâ discessu aliquid mihi invenire videor, quod
ignoscere

APPEND. III. ignoscere magis quàm acerbiùs reprehendere debeam, multo minùs inclementiùs damnare. Libertatem prophetandi, modo pia ac sobria sit, cum charitate ac mansuetudine conjuncta, nec contra analogiam *fidei semel sanctis traditæ*, adeo non vituperandam, ut etiam probandam censeam. De rebus adiaphoris cum nemine contendendum puto. Ecclesias Reformatas, etsi in aliquibus a nostrâ Anglicanâ dissentientes, libenter amplector. Optarem equidem regimen Episcopale bene temperatum, et ab omni injustâ dominatione sejunctum, quale apud nos obtinet, et, siquid ego in his rebus sapiam, ab ipso Apostolorum ævo in Ecclesiâ receptum fuerit, et ab iis omnibus fuisset retentum; nec despero quin aliquando restitutum, si non ipse videam, at posteri videbunt. Interim absit ut ego tam ferrei pectoris sim, ut ob ejusmodi defectum (sic mihi absque omni invidiâ appellare liceat) aliquas earum a communione nostrâ abscindendas credam; aut cum quibusdam furiosis inter nos scriptoribus, eas nulla vera ac valida Sacramenta habere, adeoque vix Christianos esse pronuntiem. Unionem arctiorem inter omnes Reformatos procurare quovis pretio vellem. Hæc si in regimine Ecclesiastico, ac publicis Ecclesiarum officiis obtineri potuit; aut ego plurimum fallor, aut id solum brevi conducirer ad animorum inter eos unionem conciliandam; et viam sterneret ad plenam in omnibus majoris momenti dogmatibus concordiam stabiliendam. Quantum hoc ad Religionis nostræ securitatem conducirer; quantum etiam ad Pseudo-catholicorum Romanensium conversionem, cæcus sit qui non videat.—Sed abripuit me longius quam par esset, hæc semper mihi dulcis de pace ac unione Ecclesiarum Reformatarum cogitatio.—&c. &c.

Nº XX.

Archbishop Wake's Letter to the Pastors and Professors of Geneva.

8 Apr. 1719.

QUAMVIS literis vestris nihil mihi gratiùs potuit afferri, non tamen absque summo dolore, vix oculis ficcis, eas perlegi; neque credo ququam esse tam ferrei pectoris, qui ad ea mala quæ in illis referuntur non perhorrescat; mireturque talia ab hominibus erga homines, a popularibus erga populares suos, a Christianis denique erga Christianos, idque (quod fidem omnem exuperare valeat) etiam religionis causâ, fieri et perpetrari.

Vos interim, venerandi viri, quod vestri erat officii, sedulo præstitistis. Delegatos Ecclesiarum Hungaricarum amice accepistis. Querimoniam eorum, eâ quâ par erat charitate atque sympathiâ fraternâ audivistis; nullâque morâ adhibita ad remedium malis ipsorum inveniendum omnes vestras cogitationes convertistis. Perillustres magistratus vestros, cæteros Reformatæ Religionis principes atque senatores, ad persecutiones horum fratrum vestrorum seriò considerandas, excitavistis; et ut suam authoritatem interponerent ad sedandas eorum oppressiones enixissimè obsecrâstis.

Denique, nequid vel minimi ponderis desideretur quo studium vestrum in hoc tam insigni charitatis opere exequendo ostendatis, etiam meâ qualicunque operâ uti voluistis, ad animum Augustissimi Regis nostri commovendum, ne in hac tam gravi suâ necessitate afflictis Christi servis deesset.

O amorem

O amorem vere Christianum! et qualem deceat ejusdem corporis membra APPEND.
erga se invicem habere! Dignum profecto et vobis, et eximio illo vestro III.
congressu, opus: ut quo præcipue tempore convenistis ad laudes Dei celebrandas, qui per duo jam secula Religionem Reformatam vobis incolumem servaverit; eodem etiam illam ipsam Religionem Evangelicam in aliis regionibus oppressam, concussam, ac tantum non extremum quasi spiritum trahentem, sublevetis, et, si fieri possit, in integrum restituatis.

Ego vero, fratres charissimi, et propriâ voluntate motus, et vestro tam illustri exemplo impulsus, adeo eodem vobiscum ardore accendor, ut nihil non tentandum putem, quo vestris tam piis, tam justis, tamque benignis conatibus optatum successum compararem.

Imprimis igitur nobilem virum Comitem Sunderlandiæ Primarium Regis Ministrum sedulò adivi: Litteras vestras illi communicavi: Petii, oravi, ut in hac re suam mihi operam atque auxilium concedere vellet; utque simul Regiam Majestatem adiremus; non quod de ipsius promptâ voluntate dubitarem, sed ut quæ in hac causâ facienda essent, eo majori vigore atque promptitudine perficerentur. Successit, fere ultrâ spem, conatus noster. Utriusque Ecclesiæ tum Hungariæ tum vicinæ Vallenfis, oppressiones Regi, eo quo par erat affectu, exposuimus. Favorem ejus atque auctoritatem apud Cæsarem Regemque Sardinie obnixè imploravimus, ut ab his tam injustis vexationibus, eorum jussu et mandatis, liberentur. Et præcipue quod ad Pedemontanas Ecclesias attinet, etiam adhortati sumus, ut jure suo a Rege Sardinie postularer, ut pacta in his quæ Religionis exercitium concernent, earum gratiâ inita meliori fide in posterum observentur. Annuit votis nostris Rex Serenissimus: Neque dubito quin legatis suis jamdudum præceperit, ut omnem quam possunt operam suo nomine impendant, quo ab istis adeo iniquis oppressionibus utriusque Ecclesiæ membra liberentur. Orandus Deus ut tantis Principis conatibus, in hac tam justâ, tam piâ, tam religioni Christianæ proficuâ interpellatione aspirare dignetur; et oppressis suis servis exoptatam requiem tandem concedere, pro immensâ suâ misericordiâ, velit.

Interim, dum hæc feliciter, uti spero, peraguntur, ignoscite, fratres dilectissimi, si majoris quidem laboris atque difficultatis, sed longe maximi omnibus commodi, inceptum, vobis proponam; in quo et sæpe alias et hoc tempore complures primariæ dignitatis viri summo studio allaborant; et quod ab omnibus, quibus puritas Evangelii re ipsa cordi sit, una secum allaborandum sperant. Jamdudum sentitis quo mea tendit adhortatio; ad unionem nimirum inter omnes quæ ubique sunt Ecclesias, quæ his ultimis seculis a communione, seu verius tyrannide Pontificis Romani sese subduxerunt sedulò promovendam. Quin hoc fieri possit, si quidem animum ad concordiam promptum omnes attulerimus, nullatenus dubitandum est: Quin fieri debeat, nemo prudens negaverit, &c. &c.

Vos interim, F. C. hoc agite, ut saltem inter vos ipsos pax atque concordia inviolabiliter conservetur. Summo quippe dolore, anno præterito, accepi dissensiones inter vos ortas fuisse, de capitulis aliquot circa doctrinam de Gratiâ Universali, aliisque quæstionibus longe difficillimis; in quibus optimi viri et doctissimi Theologi idem per omnia haudquaquam sentiunt. Angit hoc fanè, idque non mediocriter, animum meum. Et quamvis nollem vobis:

APPEND. videri ἀλλοτριεπισκοπεῖν, aut in alienam (quod aiunt) messem falcem meam immittere; permittite tamen ut in Spiritu charitatis, eoque quo erga vos feror amore fraterno, vos obsecrem, et in Domino obtester, ut in huiusmodi rebus, quatenus id fieri possit, idem sentiat omnes; quod si id non assequi valeatis, ut saltem sic alii alios feratis, ut nullum sit inter vos schisma, nullus querimoniarum aliquorum adversus alios locus: Ut non nimium curiosi sitis in iis determinandis quæ Deus non admodum clare revelaverit, quæque absque salutis dispendio tuto nesciri poterint. Quæ sapientissimi prædecessores nostri, in omnibus suis confessionibus, cautè tractanda censuerunt, eaque moderatione, ut universi in iis subscribendis consentirent: Et à quorum prudenti cautela sicubi postea discessum fuerit; contentiones, lites, inimicitiae, aliaque infinita incommoda, protinus subsecuta sunt.

In his disquisitionibus Lutherani a Reformatis dissident; nec Reformati ipsi prorsus inter se conveniunt. Ecclesia Anglicana optimo consilio, exemplo ab omnibus imitando, nullius conscientiae, his in rebus, jugum imponit. Quæ de illis in articulis suis statuerit, talia sunt, ut ab omnibus ex æquo admittantur. His contenta, nec ipsa aliquid amplius requirit curiosius statuere. Hinc summa inter nos pax cum sobria sentiendi libertate conjuncta. Utinam et vobis iisdem conditionibus, concordia stabiliatur! Utque veteri confessione vestra Helveticâ contenti, neque alicui permitteretis aliter docere; neque ab aliquo quidpiam profitendum requireretis, ultra id quod ab initio requisitum fuerit. Cum tamen summi illi viri Calvinus et Beza (ut de aliis taceatur) secus de his articulis sentirent, quam alii plures; quos tamen non solum tolerandos, sed et pro fratribus habendos rite ac sapienter judicârunt.

Hoc vobis non modo pacem inter vos ipsos conciliabit, verum etiam concordiam cum aliis Ecclesiis Reformatis factam tectam tuebitur. Absque huiusmodi temperamine, unio illa cum Protestantibus, tantoperè desiderata, nullo modo iniri poterit: Vos, igitur, serio hæc, ut par est, considerate: Nec a nobis, a plerisque aliis Reformatis, etiam a vestris antecessoribus novis ac durioribus impositionibus secedite, &c. &c.

N. B. *The former part of this letter, which relates to the intercession of Archbishop WAKE in behalf of the Hungarian and Piedmontese Churches, has never been hitherto published. The latter part beginning with these words: "Interim dum hæc feliciter paraguntur, ignoscite," &c. was inserted by Professor TURRETIN of Geneva, in his work, intituled, Nubes Testium. The words "Interim dum hæc," &c. were, from an ignorance of their connexion with what goes before, supposed by some learned men to relate to the projected union between the English and Gallican Churches; and KIORNINGIUS, who says, in his Dissertation de Consecrationibus Episcoporum Anglorum, that Dr. WAKE communicated this project to the Divines of Geneva, fell into this mistake, and probably drew Dr. MOSHEIM after him.*

XXI.

Extract from Archbishop Wake's Letter to Professor Schurer at Bern,
July 1718.

DE Angliâ nostrâ te peramanter et sentire et scribere plurimum gaudeo. Quanquam enim non adeo cæcus sim patriæ meæ amator, ut non plurima hîc videam quæ vel penitus sublata vel in melius mutata quovis pretio vellem, tamen aliqua etiam in hâc temporum fæce occurrere, optimis etiam seculis digna, et quæ ipsa primæva Ecclesia Christiana probare, ne dicam et laudare, potuisset, et tu æquissimè agnoscis et nos nobis gratulamur.

Nº XXII.

To Professor Turretin, July 1718.

Speaking of Bishop Davenant's Opinion as agreeable to his own:

UTINAM sic sentiremus omnes! Et, fundamentalibus religionis articulis semper salvis, nihil ultra ab aliquo subscribendum requireremus, quod bonorum hominum conscientias oneri esse potest, certe Ecclesiæ utilitatem parum promovebit. — Ut enim de hâc Ecclesiarum Reformatarum utilitate paucis dicam. Primum earum stabilimentum in hoc consistere ut omnes sese, quantum fieri possit, contra Papalem potentiam ac tyrannidem tueantur, nemini credo dubium esse possit. Ut in hunc finem quàm arctissimè inter se uniantur, et in idem corpus coalescant; adeo ut siquid alicui ex iis Ecclesiæ damni aut detrimenti a communi hoste fuerit illatum, id ab omnibus tanquam suum haberetur, concedi etiam necesse est.

Ut denique pax et concordia cujuslibet Ecclesiæ Reformatæ inter suos, ac cum aliis omnibus ejusmodi Ecclesiis conservetur; unicuique viro bono, sed præsertim Ecclesiarum illarum magistratibus atque ministris totis viribus intendendum esse, adeo clarè apparet, ut nullâ probatione firmiori indigeat.

Afterwards:

Quid in hâc re aliud faciendum restat, nisi ut tuâ et amicorum tuorum auctoritate primò facultas vestra Theologica, Magistratus, Ministri, Cives Genevenses; deinde eorum exemplo atque hortatu reliqua etiam fœderis Helvetici membra Reformatâ omnem lapidem moveant, ut pacem Ecclesiis Bernensibus restituant? Neque id ego sic fieri vellem, ut non simul et Religionis veritati et doctrinæ puritati consulatur. Subscribant Ministri, Professores, Theologi, Confessioni vestræ veteri, anno editæ: Prohibeantur, sub quâvislibet poenâ, ne ullam in Concionibus, Scriptis, Thesibus, Prælectionibus sententiam publicè tueantur, illi Confessi ni quovis modo contrarium. Id solum caveatur, ne multiplicentur hujusmodi Subscriptiones absque necessitate; neque stricte nimis inquiretur in privatas hominum eruditorum sententias;

APPEND.
III.

tentias; modo suis opinionibus frui pacificè velint; et neque docendo, neque disputando, neque scribendo a publicâ confessione secedere, aut errores suos (si tamen errores reverà fuerint) in scandalum cujusvis, multo magis Ecclesiæ aut Reipublicæ divulgare.—Habes, vir spectatissime, sententiam meam.

N° XXIII.

Extract from a Letter of Archbishop *Wake* to Professor *Schurer* at Bern,
July 1719.

QUÆ de formulâ Consensus mihi narras, abunde placent: qui uti nolum laqueum absque causâ injici conscientiis bonorum atque eruditorum hominum; ita neque fræna laxanda cenfeo quibuscunque novatoribus ad pacem publicè turbendam; eaque vel scribenda vel docenda, quæ viris piis jure scandalum præbeant, quæque Confessioni vestræ olim stabilitæ falsitatis notam injuriâ inurere videantur. Intra hos igitur limites si steterint Magistratus vestri, neque aliquid amplius a Lausannensibus requirant, nisi ut hoc demum sine formulæ Consensus subscribant; sperandum est nullum schisma, eâ de causâ, inter vos exoriturum. Pacem publicam tueri, etiam in rebus ad fidem spectantibus, Magistratus Christianus et potest et debet. Conscientiis hominum credenda imponere, nisi in rebus clavis et perspicuis, et ad salutem omnino necessariis nec potest, nec debet. Quod si contra faciat, subditis tamen semper licebit ad Apostolorum exemplar, si quidem aliquid falsi, aut incertæ veritatis iis subscribendum injunxerint, obedire Deo potius quam hominibus.

N° XXIV.

Extracts from Archbishop *Wake's* Letter to Professor *Turretin*, in Answer to one from him, dated December 1, 1718.

RES Bernensium Ecclesiasticas nondum penitus tranquillasse esse et doleo et miror; eoque magis, quod hisce temporibus hæc de Décretis divinis altercationes ubique ferè alibi ad exitum sint perductæ. Quæ mea sit de iis sententia, nec adhuc cuiquam apertè declaravi, neque, ut deinceps patefaciam, facile me patiar induci. Hoc apud nos, tum ex mandatis regiis, tum ex diu servatâ (utinam semper servandâ) consuetudine fixum est atque stabilitum, neque a quoquam exquirere quid de his rebus sentiat, modo Articulis Religionis, publicâ auctoritate constitutis, subscribat; neque in Concionibus aut etiam Disputationibus Theologicis, aliquid amplius de iis determinare, quàm quod illi Articuli expressè statuunt et ab omnibus ad Ministerii munus admittendis profitendum requirant.

Then follows an historical Narrative of the Rise and Occasion and Censure of the Lambeth Articles, as also of the Rise and Progress of Arminianism under the Reigns of James I, and Charles I, and of the subsiding of all Disputes of that kind under Charles II.—He then subjoins:

Et

Et quidem illud imprimis observatu dignum æstimo, quàm moderatè, quàm prudenter, in hac tam difficili disquisitione, optimi illi viri, Martyres ac Confessores Christi constantissimi, quos divina Providentia ad Reformandam hanc nostram Ecclesiam seligere dignatus est, se gesserunt. Non illi curiositati cufvis aliquid indulgendum putârunt; non sed incertis hominum hypothesebus de decretis divinis alicujus fidem alligare fas esse censuerunt. Sciebant quàm inscrutabilia sint consilia Dei; et quanto intervallo omnes nostras cogitationes exuperent. Ideoque non religiosè minùs quàm sapienter inter justos terminos sese continuerunt; neque in necessariis ad fidem nostram de hisce mysteriis stabiliendam deficientes; neque in non-necessariis determinandis officiosi; unde forte pro verâ fide errorem, pro pace discordiam, pro fraternâ unionem ac charitate divisionem, odia, inimicitias in Ecclesiam Christi inducere poterant.

Hæc fuit eorum simplicitas verè evangelica; pietate non minùs quàm sapientiâ commendabilis; eoque magis suspicienda, ac ferè pro divinâ habenda; quod tot annorum experienciâ reperta sit non solum optimam fuisse pacis ac concordiae regulam, verum etiam unicum contra schismata et divisiones remedium.

Speaking afterwards of the Consensus, he adds:

Sunt igitur horum articulorum pars maxima illius generis, in quibus ab invicem dissentire nobis omnibus liceat, absque dispendio veritatis. Quia sunt ejusmodi de quibus Deus consilium suum non adeò clarè aut præcisè revelaverit, quin etiam eruditissimi atque perspicacissimi viri in suis de iis determinationibus, errare possint; aut potius nunquam certi esse possunt se non errasse. Quid verò imprudentius, quid arrogantius, quid denique humilitate, non jam dico Christianorum, sed et hominum non nimium sibi blandientium indignius esset, quàm de rebus adeo obscuris, adeo incertis, adeo inter ipsos ejusdem Communionis Symmystas adhuc litigatis, distinctè aliquid definire; et ab aliis auferre eam quam nos nobis quasi jure nostro asserimus sentiendi libertatem? O quantum potuit insana φιλαυλία! Et in aliorum conscientias, quam omnes verbis rejicimus, plerique re exerere cupimus, dominandi libido! Benedictus Deus, qui alium plerumque, in hoc nostro orbe, animum indiderit!

APPENDIXES TO MOSHELM'S

N° XXV.

Archbishop Wake's Letter to Mr. Jablonski, in Answer to the two following Questions :

An de Unione Evangelicorum cum Ecclesiâ Romanâ agendum sit?

Vel,

An omnis eâ de re Tractatio tanquam periculosa et fallax omnino sit evitanda?

QUOD de fœdere nescio quo cum Pontificiis ineundo scribis somniare temerarios quosdam apud vos homines suæ tranquillitatis magis quam veritatis amatores; non possum non mirari ecquod inde commodi ecclesiis Reformatis proponunt. Adeone ulli e nostris aut incognita aut inexperta est Romanensium superbia atque tyrannis, ut credatur vel illos a suo fastigio potestatis, ac infallibilitatis, nostri gratiâ, sese dimissuros, vel nos eorum causâ ad servitutem tam diu rejectam ultro iterum redituros? Hoc tam perniciosum, tam infame facinus, ab animis omnium nostrorum longe avertat Deus! Imo potius bona, patriam, parentes, omnia relinquamus quàm ut sic inveniamur *ἑτεροζυγῶντες ἀπίστοις*: (quidni enim ipsis hîc Apostoli vocibus utar?)

Neque tamen sic intelligi vellem quasi omnem omnino de pace tractatum etiam cum Pontificiis refugiendum putarem. Tractemus, si libet, sed ut decet, cum æqualibus: Neque aut nos in illos potestatem indebitam nobis arrogemus, neque illis in nos concedamus. Christiani sunt illi? et nos Christiani. Catholici? et nos Catholici. Errare nos possumus? etiam illi possunt errare. Liberi sunt illi a dominio nostro? neque nos illis ullâ in re subditi sumus. Si igitur cum illis omnino sit agendum, ante omnia necesse fuerit in prævias condiciones tractandi convenire; utque mutuò statuatur, nullam esse inter eos vel inter nos infallibilitatis prærogativam, alterutri nostrum a Christo concessam: Posse utrinque errari, fortè et utrinque erratum esse. Utrorumque ergo dogmata liberè examinanda, et ad amussim verbi Dei exigenda. Renuntiandum in super prætensæ auctoritati tum summi quem vocant Pontificis, tum Ecclesiæ Romanæ in alias Christi Ecclesias; ut sic, ab eorum dominatione tuti, ex æquo cum illis agere possimus. De pluribus atque præcipuis Doctrinæ Christianæ capitibus, in quibus utrinque consentimus, nulla lis erit. De cæteris consideretur imprimis quousque invicem concordari valeat; et in quibus nondum in eandem sententiam concurriri potest, quærat porro, an talia sint, quæ salvâ pace mutuò tolerari nequeant. Si hoc conveniatur, quærat denique de Liturgiâ Publicâ, an talem nobis exhiberi curabunt, ut omnes simul ad eundem Dei cultum amicè accedere valeamus. Si qui sint Romanæ Ecclesiæ Symmystæ adeò æqui, ut his conditionibus sincerè nobiscum agere velint; non video cur ab eorum colloquio abstineamus. Absque hujusmodi stipulatione præmissâ frustra cum iis tractabimus: nisi sub pacis conciliandæ prætextu veritati renuntiare decreverimus.

Habes, vir clarissime, meam qualemcumque hâc de re sententiam: Extemporaneam quidem illam, nec pro materiæ dignitate satis ponderatam; sed tamen

tamen justam, et, nisi ego plurimum fallor, talem a quâ absque extremo periculo nunquam a nostris discedi possit. Faxit Deus, ut in hisce considerandis non tam nostra quæramus quàm ea quæ sint Jesu Christi! Nec adeo hujus seculi pacem amemus, ut futuri præmia amittamus. Tibi, vir præstantissime, sapientiam, prudentiam, eruditionem non vulgarem concessit Deus: etiam constantiam in veritate tuendâ, pro quâ tanta et huc usque passus fueris, et deinceps pati, te paratum ostendis. Tuo itaque exemplo alios instruas, neque concordiam atque unionem cum ullis Christi discipulis, ubi justis conditionibus iniri possit, pertinaciter refugere; neque iniquis conditionibus stolidè timidè, admittere: aut vanâ spe pacis deliniti, ad servitutis Papalis jugum colla submittere, quod neque nos, neque patres nostri ferre potuere. Hoc tam grave scandalum, tam perniciosam prævaricationem ab Ecclesiis Reformatis ut semper avertat Deus, summo ardore precatur,

APPEND.
III.

Spectatissime Vir,

Frater tuus in Christo Colendissimus, &c.

Maii 22, 1719.

A D D I.

ADDITIONS and CORRECTIONS
 TO
 MOSHEIM'S
 ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

VOLUME I.

VOL. I.

PAGE 7, line 18, *after* divinities, *add this note*: See Dr. JOHN LELAND's excellent account of the religious sentiments, moral conduct, and future prospects of the Pagans, in his large work, entitled, *The Advantage and Necessity of the Christian Revelation*.

Ib. l. 36, *for* besides the institutions invented by NUMA and others, contrived with political views, *read*, besides the institutions which NUMA and others had invented with political views.

10, l. 5, *for* subtle, *read*, subtile.

11, l. 4, *for* virtues, *read*, perfections; *and*, in the note on that sentence, l. 1, *dele* of him, *and*, l. 2, *for* virtues, *read* perfections.

Ib. l. 25, *for* observe the tendency of, *read*, conclude from; *and*, l. 28, *dele*, and will draw from it the conclusions to which it so naturally leads.

13, l. 3, *for* Orders were, *read*, Order was.

14, l. 5, *for* in a manner, *read*, in a great measure.

Ib. l. 10, *dele* were.

16, l. 8, *for* Be that as it will, I see, *read*, But I see.

VOL. III.

17, l. 23, *for* deformed, *read*, disfigured.

19, l. 28, *for* contemplating, *read*, considering.

22, l. 6, *after* doubted, *add* but; *and* l. 23, *for* wrote, *read*, sent.

Ib. at the end of note [o], *add as follows*:

It is remarkable, that this story is not mentioned by any writer before EUSEBIUS; that it is but little taken notice of by succeeding writers; that the whole affair was unknown to CHRIST's apostles, and to the Christians, their contemporaries, as is manifest, from the early disputes about the method of receiving gentile converts into the church, which this story, had it been true, must have entirely decided. As to the letters, no doubt can be made of their spuriousness; since, if CHRIST had written a letter to ABGARUS, it would have been a part of Sacred Scripture, and would have been placed at the head of all the books of the New Testament. See LARDNER's *Collection of Ancient Jewish and Heathen Testimonies*, vol. i. p. 297, &c. It must be observed, in behalf of EUSEBIUS, that he relates this story, as drawn from the archives of Edessa.

24, l. 19, *for* perfect, *read*, perfect.

K

P. 27,

P. 27, at the end of note [c], add as follows;

This matter has been examined anew, with his usual diligence and accuracy, by the learned Dr. LARDNER, in the third volume of his *Collection of Jewish and Heathen Testimonies to the Truth of the Christian Religion*, &c. p. 310, &c. He thinks that the testimonies of JUSTIN MARTYR and TERTULLIAN who, in apologies for Christianity, that were presented, or at least addressed to the Emperor and Senate of Rome, or to Magistrates of high authority in the Empire, affirm that PILATE sent to TIBERIUS an account of the Death and Resurrection of CHRIST, deserve some regard; though some writers, and particularly OROSIUS, have made alterations and additions in the original narration of TERTULLIAN, that are too much adapted to diminish the credibility of the whole.

32, l. 10, for process, read, proceeding.

33, l. 20, for or, read, nor, twice.

39, l. 7, of note [m], for external, read, eternal.

44, note, l. 3, for Patriarchs, read, Patriarchs.

Ib. l. 20, for This account of the four different opinions with respect to church-government, I have taken from, read, The reader will find an ample account of these four different opinions with respect to church-government in.

49, l. 4, for difference, read, deference.

50, read the note [t] thus: See the ample account that is given of these two Greek Epistles of CLEMENS by the learned Dr. LARDNER, in the first volume of the second part of his valuable work, intitled, *The Credibility of the Gospel History*, &c. &c.

51, l. 3, after CLEMENTINA, add this note: Besides these writings attributed to CLEMENS, we may reckon two epistles which the learned WETSTEIN found in a Syriac version of the New Testament, which he took the pains to translate from Syriac into Latin, and has subjoined both the original and the translation to his famous edition of the Greek Testament, published at Amsterdam, in two volumes in folio, in the years 1751

and 1752. The title prefixed to these epistles is as follows: DUE EPISTOLAE S. CLEMENTIS Romani, Discipuli PETRI Apostoli, quas ex Codice Manuscripto Novi Test. Syriaci nunc primum erutas, cum versione Latinâ adposita, edidit. JO. JACOBUS WESTENIUS. The Manuscript of the Syriac version, from whence these epistles were taken, was procured by the good offices of Sir JAMES PORTER, a judicious patron of literature and men of letters, who, at that time, was British ambassador at Constantinople. The authenticity of these epistles is boldly maintained by WETSTEIN, and learnedly opposed by Dr. LARDNER in a *Dissertation upon the Two Epistles ascribed to CLEMENT of Rome, lately published by Mr. WETSTEIN*, &c. The celebrated Professor VENEMA, of Franeker, suspected also the spuriousness of these epistles; see an account of his controversy with WETSTEIN on that subject, in the *Bibliothèque des Sciences & des Beaux Arts*, tom. ii, p. 51, &c. p. 311.

52, l. 5, for attributed, read, ascribed.

53, l. 17, for subtle, read, subtile.

Ib. l. 28, dele in.

62, l. 6, for seditions, read, divisions.

64, l. 41, dele the most.

65, l. penult. for in the most absurd manner, read, absurdly.

66, l. 6, for shall comprehend, read, may see.

75, l. 13 and 16, for ascribed, read, attributed.

Ib. note l. 2, for LAUROQUE, read, LARROQUE; and l. 5, for JABLONSKI, read, JABLONSKI; and in the same note, place a reference at Sir PETER KING, and add thus: It is by a mistake, that Dr. MOSHEIM confounds Sir PETER KING, Lord Chancellor of England, with the person who carried on the controversy with MOYLE, concerning the *thundering legion*. MOYLE's adversary was Mr. KING, a clergyman, rector of *Topsham*, near *Exeter*, which was the place of his nativity, and also of the famous Chancellor's, who bore his name. See the *Letters* addressed to the Reverend Mr. KING, in the *Posthumous Collection of Locke's*

Locke's Letters, published by COLLINS. See also LARDNER's *Collection of Heathen and Jewish Testimonies*, &c. vol. ii, p. 249, &c.

P. 6, l. 26, *for* tumults and seditions were raised among, *read*, clamours were raised against.

79, l. 5, *for* and, *read*, in a.

80, l. 13, *after* AMMONIUS, *add this note*:

The learned Dr. LARDNER does not think it possible, that CELSUS could have been of the sect of AMMONIUS; since the former lived and wrote in the second century; whereas the latter did not flourish before the third. And, indeed, we learn from ORIGEN himself, that he knew of two only of the name of CELSUS; one who lived in the time of NERO; and the other, in the reign of ADRIAN and afterwards. The latter was the philosopher, who wrote against Christianity.

83, *at the end of the note [1], add thus*:

Since the first edition of this work was published, the learned Dr. LARDNER has maintained, not without a certain degree of asperity, which is unusual in his valuable writings, the opinion of FABRICIUS, against EUSEBIUS, and particularly against Dr. MOSHEIM. See his *Collection of Heathen and Jewish Testimonies*, vol. iii. p. 195, &c. Dr. MOSHEIM was once of the same opinion with FABRICIUS; and he maintained it in a Dissertation *De Ecclesia turbata per recentiores PLATONICOS*; but he afterwards saw reason to change his mind. These reasons may be seen in his book *De Rebus Christianorum ante Const. Mag.* p. 281, &c. They indeed weigh little with Dr. LARDNER, who, however, opposes nothing to them but mere assertions, unsupported by the smallest glimpse of evidence. For the Letter of ORIGEN he quotes from EUSEBIUS, is so far from proving that AMMONIUS was merely a Heathen philosopher, and not a Christian, that it would not be sufficient to demonstrate that there was ever such a person as AMMONIUS in the world; since he is not so much as named in that letter. But, allowing with VALESIIUS that it is AMMONIUS

whom ORIGEN has in view, when he talks of the philosophical master from whom he and HERACLAS received instruction, it seems very whimsical to conclude from thence, that AMMONIUS was no Christian. The coalition between Platonism and Christianity, in the second and third centuries, is a fact too fully proved to be rendered dubious by mere affirmations. The notion, therefore, of two persons bearing the name of AMMONIUS, the one a Heathen philosopher, and the other a Christian writer, of which Dr. LARDNER seems so fond, rests upon little more than an hypothesis formed to remove an imaginary difficulty.

93, l. 17, *dele* the Heretics, or.

94, l. 9, *for* practising, *read*, employing; l. 16, *for* should, *read*, ought to; l. 21, *for* pursuit, *read*, cause.

96, l. 16, *dele* the second their.

98, l. 28, *for* profession, *read*, professors.

99, *read the first five lines thus*: XVII.

It is here to be attentively observed, that the form used in the exclusion of heinous offenders from the society of Christians was, at first, extremely simple. A small number, &c. And l. 13, *after* severe, *add thus*: They will justify the rulers of the primitive church in their refusing to restore excommunicated members to their forfeited privileges, before they had given incontestable marks of the sincerity of their repentance.

103, l. ult. *for* inconveniences, *read*, inconveniences.

109, l. penult. *for* upon, *read*, with.

115, l. 15 and 19, *for* subtle, *read*, subtile.

117, l. 17, *for* contracted, *read*, entered into.

118, l. 30, *dele* however.

122, l. 3, *from* bottom, *for* 2011, *read*, 211.

135, l. 7, *for* Rom, *read*, Roman.

149, l. 37, *dele* sublime.

158, l. 4, *for* Divine Nature and CHRIST, *read*, Nature of GOD and CHRIST.

166, l. 33, *after* disease, *add reference* [9].

167, l. 9, *after* of, *add* his.

175, l. 17, *for* those, *read*, these.

176, *after* note [x], *add*, See Dr. MIDDLETON's *Free Inquiry into the Miraculous*

lous Powers, which are said to have subsisted in the Christian Church, &c. in which a very different opinion is maintained. See, however, on the other side, the answers of CHURCH and DODWELL to MIDDLETON's Inquiry.

179, l. 4, *for those, read, though.*

184, l. 20, *for purpose, read, purpose.*

192, note [t], *for DOOWELL, read, DODWELL.*

198, l. 23, *for growing, read, glowing; and correct the next sentence thus: It was, therefore, rather the name only, than the thing itself, which was transported into the European countries, though this name was, indeed, accompanied with a certain resemblance, or distant imitation of the monastic life, instituted by ANTONY and others in the East.*

199, l. 2, *for They were, read, It was; and l. 11, dele order of the.*

204, l. 19, *for contemplated, read, beheld.*

205, l. 18, *for could live, read, could not live.*

206, l. 16, *for croifiers, read, crofiers.*

207, l. 3, *for hence the true and only, read, here we must look for the true.*

209, l. 6, *for was, read, were.*

213, l. 14, *for to that, read, to a; and l. 34, for fell, read, was allotted.*

214, l. 14, *for restore, read, restored; and l. 22, for those, read, these.*

215, l. 29, *for consequence, read, consequences.*

217, l. 21, *for at Nice, read, of Nice.*

218, note [u], l. 4, *for who, read, which.*

223, note [f], l. 2, *for on, read, or.*

225, l. 14, *for those, read, these; and note [o], for Uries, read, Vries,*

228, l. 6, *from bottom, for those, read, these.*

231, l. 31, *dele either.*

233, l. 29, *for did they discover, read, if they detected.*

238, l. 2, *after arts, add this note: These seven liberal arts were grammar, rhetoric, logic, arithmetic, music, geometry, and astronomy. See Cent. XI. p. 251.*

262, l. 5, *for pronounced, read, delivered; and l. 22, for sea, read, see.*

267, l. 2, *for discipline, read, disciples.*

274, l. 6, *for Be that as it will, read, However that may have been.*

285, l. 4, *for those, read, these, twice.*

286, l. 10, *for those, read, the; and l. 32, for latter, read, modern; and in note [g], alter the same word.*

287, l. 7, *for latter, read, modern.*

292, l. 26, *for observe, read, remark.*

297, l. 7, *for followed, read, consulted.*

300, l. 16, *for who were, read, which was.*

301, note, l. 4, *for were, read, was.*

310, l. 6, *for those, read, these; and l. 14, dele famous.*

311, *after note [b], add: See on this subject a very learned dissertation, published by M. DE GUIGNES, in the thirtieth volume of the Memoires de Litterature tirés des Registres de l'Academie Royale des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres, in which he proves that the Christians were settled in China so early as the seventh century. He remarks, indeed, that the Nestorians and other Christians were for a long time confounded, in the Chinese annals, with the worshippers of Fo, an Indian idol, whose rites were introduced into China about sixty-five years after the birth of CHRIST, and that this circumstance has deceived DE LA CROZE, BEAUSOBRE, and some other learned men, who have raised specious objections against the hypothesis that maintains the early introduction of Christianity into this great empire. A reader, properly informed, will lend little or no attention to the account given of this matter by VOLTAIRE, in the first volume of his Essai sur l'Histoire Generale, &c. A poet, who recounts facts, or denies them, without deigning to produce his authorities, must not expect to meet with the credit that is due to an historian.*

319, l. 10, *for extent, read, extant.*

326, l. 4, *for impious, read, ignoble; and l. 7, for invented, read, contrived.*

327, l. 36, *for entensive, read, extensive.*

329, l. 15, *for CONSTATINE, read, CONSTANTINE.*

335, note [t], l. penult. *read, their; and l. ult. read, origine.*

346, l. 32, *for Be that as it may, read, However this question be, it is undeniably certain that; and l. 34, dele undoubtedly.*

- P. 347, l. 27, *dele* among.
 349, l. 26, *for* professions, *read*, possession; *and* l. 34, *for* profession, *read*, possession.
 350, l. 18, *dele* also.
 352, l. 18, *for* his, *read*, this.
 364, l. 12, *for* thus delivering, *read*, thus they delivered.
 367, *note*, l. 20, *for* Tritheite, *read*, Tritheist.
 370, l. 3, *for* GREGORY I and II, *read*, II and III.
 371, l. 15, *for* opinion, *read*, opinions.
 384, l. 11, *for* to prevent, *read*, prevented.
 390, l. 4, *for* carried, *read*, carried on.
 391, l. 31, *for* sect, *read* sex.
 394, l. 19, *for* code, *read*, system.
 414, l. 30, *for* and affirm, *read*, and to affirm.
 416, l. 24, *for* RABAN, *read*, RABANUS.
 422, l. 39, *for* deposition, *read*, degradation.
 423, l. 18, *for* at least, it is not easy to determine whether, *read*, and it would be bold to affirm that.
 428, l. 15, *for* Be that as it may, they were not certainly, *read*, most evident.
 430, l. 3, *for* For they did not deny, *read*, They maintained indeed.
 432, l. 16, *for* which, *read*, who.
 460, l. 29, *for* mask, *read*, cover.
 462, l. 6, *for* present, *read*, presents.
 463, l. 12, *for* preventing, *read*, prevented.
 465, l. 18, *dele* in order.
 466, *note*, l. 4, *for* versed in the knowledge of, *read*, acquainted with.
 469, l. 6, *for* whores, *read*, prostitutes; *and* l. 12, *for* distinguished by, *read*, distinguished, in the French language, by.
 471, l. 25, *for* Nor will we deny, *read*, Nor is it to be denied.
 484, l. 21, *for* Norminalists, *read*, Norminalists.
 485, l. 12, *dele* Be that as it may.
 487, l. 10, *for* impudent, *read*, high.
 489, l. 2, *for* such high distinction, *read*, such a distinction; *and* l. 16, *for* name VICTOR, *read*, name of VICTOR.
 490, l. 25, *for* all in this, *read*, all part in this.
 492, l. 3, *for* nomination, *read*, denomination.
 494, l. ult. *dele* venerable.
 501, *note*, l. 5, *for* wrote, *read*, written.
 502, l. penult. *for* denedictionem, *read*, benedictionem.
 504, l. 6, *dele* the second and.
 509, l. 29, *for* uhallowed, *read*, unhallowed.
 525, *note*, l. 1, *for* LANCFRANC, *read*, LANFRANC.
 534, l. 17, *for* archbishop, *read*, archdeacon; *and in note*, *for* HILDEBERT, *read*, HILDEBERT DE LAVARDIN.
 551, l. 3, *for* among them, but now, *read*, among them. They now.
 553, *note* [k], l. 7, *for* versed in, *read*, acquainted with.
 566, l. 9, *after* restoring, *add*, to their primitive lustre; *and*, in l. 11, *dele* to their primitive lustre and credit.
 568, l. 33, *dele* spiritual.
 571, l. 2, *for* and did nothing more than furnish, *read*, and furnished.
 572, l. 15, *dele* carnal and.
 576, l. 14, *dele* spiritual and.
 582, *note*, l. 17, *before* See RAPIN THOYRAS, *add*: On the contrary, various circumstances concur, to prove that HENRY was entirely innocent of this murder. Mr. HUME mentions particularly one which is worthy of notice. The King, suspecting the design of the four gentlemen above-mentioned, by some menacing expressions they had dropt, " *dispatched* (says Mr. HUME) " a messenger after them, charging them " to attempt nothing against the person " of the Primate: but these orders came " too late." See his *History of England*, vol. i. p. 294. *And dele* the citation at the bottom from Dr. SMOLLET.
 587, l. 9, *for* furious, *read*, warm.
 590, l. 8, *for* numbers, *read*, members.
 592, *note* [l], *for* POIREE, *read*, PORRE.
 603, l. 15, *for* Moralia, &c. *read*, Moral Observations on the Book of JOB, the Prophecy of AMOS, and the Lamentations of JEREMIAH.
 608, l. 31, *for* among, *read*, with.
 611, l. 32, *after* name, *add* of.
 616, l. 18, *dele* an; *and after note* [g], *add*: We may venture to affirm the contrary, with the learned BEZA and other writers of note; for it seems evident, from the best records, that VALDUS derived his name from the true *Valdenses*.

ADDITIONS, &c. TO MOSHEIM'S

Valdenses of *Piedmont*, whose doctrine he adopted, and were known by the names of *Vaudois* and *Valdenses*, before he or his immediate followers existed. If the *Valdenses* or *Waldenses* had derived their name from any eminent teacher, it would probably have been from VALDO, who was remarkable for the purity of his doctrine in the ninth century, and was the cotemporary and chief counsellor of BERENGARIUS. But the truth is, that they derive their name from their *Vallies* in *Piedmont*, which, in their language, are called *Vaux*; hence *Vaudois*, their true name; hence PETER, or (as others call him) JOHN of *Lyons* was called in Latin VALDUS, because he had adopted their doctrine; and hence the term *Valdenses* and *Waldenses*, used by those who write in English or Latin, in the place of *Vaudois*. The bloody Inquisitor, REINERUS SACCO, who exerted such a furious zeal for the destruction of the *Waldenses*, lived but about eighty years after VALDUS of *Lyons*, and must therefore be supposed to know whether or not he was the real founder of the *Valdenses*, or *Leonists*; and yet it is remarkable, that he speaks of the *Leonists*, mentioned by Dr. MOSHEIM in the preceding page, 615, as synonymous with *Waldenses*) as a sect that had flourished above five hundred years; nay, mentions authors of note, who make their antiquity remount to the apostolic age. See the account given of SACCO's book by the Jesuit GRETSER, in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*. I know not upon what principle Dr. MOSHEIM maintains, that the inhabitants of the *Vallies* of *Piedmont* are to be carefully distinguished from the *Waldenses*; and I am persuaded, that whoever will be at the pains to read attentively the 2d, 25th, 26th, and 27th chapters of the first book of LEGER's *Histoire Generale des Eglises Vaudaises*, will find this distinction entirely groundless.—When the Papists ask us *where our religion was before LUTHER?* we generally answer: *in the Bible*; and we answer well. But to gratify their taste for tradition and human authority, we may

add to this answer, *and in the Vallies of Piedmont.*

618, l. 5, *for* lived in a less austere manner, *read*, were less austere.

624, l. 4, *for* distinguished, *read*, extinguished.

630, *after the last line of note [d], add as follows*: The book intituled, *Liber de III Impostoribus, sive Tractatus de Vanitate Religionum*, is really a book which had no existence at the time that the most noise was made about it, and was spoken of by multitudes before it had been seen by any one person. Its supposed existence was probably owing to an impious saying of SIMON OF TOURNAY, Doctor of Divinity in the university of *Paris*, in the thirteenth century, which amounts to this: "that the *Jews* " were seduced out of their senses by " *MOSES*, the Christians by *JESUS*, " and the Gentiles by *MAHOMET*." This, or some expressions of a similar kind, were imputed to the emperor FREDERICK and other persons, and that perhaps without any real foundation; and the imaginary book, to which they have given rise, has been attributed, by different authors, to FREDERICK, to his Chancellor PETER DE VINEIS, to ALPHONSO, King of *Castile*, to BOCCACE, POGGE, the ARETINS, POMPONACE, MACHIAVEL, ERASMUS, OCHINUS, SERVETUS, RABELAIS, GIORDANO BRUNO, CAMPANELLA, and many others. In a word, the book was long spoken of before any such work existed; but the rumour, that was spread abroad, encouraged some profligate traders in licentiousness to compose, or rather compile, a bundle of miserable rhapsodies, under the famous title of the *Three Impostors*, in order to impose upon such as are fond of these pretended rarities. Accordingly, the *Spaccio della Bestia Triomphante* of GIORDANO BRUNO, and a wretched piece of impiety, called the *Spirit of Spinoza*, were the ground-work or materials from whence these hireling compilers, by modifying some passages, and adding others, drew the book which now passes under the name of the *Three Impostors*, of

of which I have seen two copies in manuscript, but no printed edition. See LA MONNOYE's *Dissertation sur le Livre de III Imposteurs*, published at Amsterdam in 1715, at the end of the fourth volume of the *Menagiana*. See also an answer to this dissertation, which was impudently exposed to the public eye in 1716, from the press of SCHEURLEER, in the *Hague*, and which contains a fabulous story of the origin of the book in question. Whoever is desirous of a more ample and a very curious account of this matter, will find it in the late PROSPER MARCHAND's *Dictionnaire Historique*, vol. ii, at the article IMPOSTORIBUS.

- 631, l. 8, for GREGORIUS, read, GEORGIUS.
 643, l. 17, for 1712, read, 1112.
 644, l. 11, for bishop, read, bishops.
 650, l. 26, for Præneste, read, Palæstrina; and dele the note [y].
 691, note, l. 1, for JOSEPH, read JOSEPH GALESIUS.
 694, l. 8, for solemne lw, read, solemn law.
 709, l. 26, for FREDERIC II, read, FREDERICK III.
 716, l. 9, for METOCHILA, read, METOCHITA.
 718, l. 29, for BULÆUS, read, BURLÆUS.
 732, l. 19, for heretics, read, heresies.
 738, l. 15, for othodox, read, orthodox.
 740, l. 8, for might be, read, might appear at first sight; and l. 27, for pontifs, read, pontif.
 741, l. 21, for acknowledge, read, acknowledged.
 742, l. 8, for advanced, read, raised.
 743, l. 28, for than any, read, than by any.
 744, l. 8, for siezed, read, infected.
 747, after note [z], add, He was archbishop of Canterbury.
 750, l. 8, for that mysterious event, read, that matter; and l. 29, for of authors, read, of the authors.
 752, l. 9, for held, read, delivered.
 754, l. 12, after manners, add, of the Mystics.
 755, read the second line thus: the monks,

- but turned upon the nature and residence of the Deity; and l. 35, for seditious, read, seducing.
 756, l. 20, for dissolved, read, suppressed.
 758, note, l. 4, for in, read, is.
 759, l. 13, for interals, read, intervals; and l. 33, for pleasure, read, desire.
 761, l. 18, for an immense, read, a great.
 765, after note [p], add, Since the publication of this work, the very learned and ingenious Mr. GERARD MEERMAN, Pensionary of Rotterdam, has published his laborious and interesting account of the origin and invention of the art of printing, under the following title, *Origines Typographicæ*; which sets this matter in its true light, by making certain distinctions, unknown to the writers who have treated this subject before him. According to the hypothesis of this learned writer (an hypothesis supported by irresistible proofs), LAURENT COSTER of Harlem invented the moveable wooden types; — GENFLEISCH and GUTTEMBERG carved metallic types at Mentz, which, though superior to the former, were still imperfect, because often unequal; — SCHOEFFER perfected the invention at Strasbourg, by casting the types in an iron mould or matrix engraved with a punchon. Thus the question is decided. — LAURENT COSTER is evidently the inventor of printing; the others only rendered the art more perfect.
 771, l. 28, for in the same, read, by the same.
 772, l. 30, dele who.
 773, l. 7, for arose, read, arisen.
 774, l. 12, for communication, read, excommunication; l. 19, for consummate, read, circumspect; and l. 38, for in pleading, read, which commanded him to plead.
 775, l. 23, for bent to stigmatize and burn, read, bent upon burning; and l. ult, for We observe, read, it may be observed.
 779, l. 12, for the council itself, read, the assembled fathers.
 780, l. 11, dele sublime; and l. 19, for contemplating, read, beholding.

- P. 781, l. 10, for the assembled fathers, *read*, the council.
 784, l. 16. for seal, *read*, zeal.
 785, l. 14, for accelerated, *read*, accelerating.
 786, l. 17, for cries, *read*, crimes.
 788, l. 17, *dele* great.
 793, l. 18, for such as, *read*, those who; and l. 20, before their ministers, *add*, the clergy; and *note*, l. 2, for wrote, *read*, written.
 794, l. 2, for WICLIF, *read*, WICKLIFF; and *note*, l. 3, for began, *read*, begun.
 796, l. 19, *dele* be; *note*, l. 4, for poniri, *read*, puniri; l. 13, for LENFAN, *read*, LENFANT, and l. 16, for it has been, *read*, it is.
 798, l. 13, *dele* all.
 799, l. 34, for Platonic doctors, *read*, Platonics.
 802, l. ult. for Fransciscan, *read*, Franciscan.

VOLUME II.

- PAGE 2, line 15, for as, *read*, since.
 3, l. 9, for shall, *read*, will; l. 11, *dele* shall comprehend; l. 13 and 15, for shall, *read*, will.
 4, l. 25, for of, *read*, about.
 12, l. ult. for native, *read*, true.
 16, l. 32, after ninety-five, *add*, Propositions.
 17, *note*, l. 17, for determined, *read*, ventured.
 18, *note*, l. 14, *dele* the lying; and l. 20, *dele* not.
 20, l. 7, for engage, *read*, encourage.
 22, *note*, l. 3, for Pirma, *read*, Pirna.
 23, l. 6, for obligeth, *read*, oblige.
 24, after l. 22, *add this note*: It may be observed here, that, before LUTHER's attack upon the store-house of indulgences, ECKIUS was his intimate friend. ECKIUS must certainly have been uncommonly unworthy, since even the mild and gentle MELANCTHON represents him as an inhuman persecutor, a sophist, and a knave, who maintained doctrines contrary to his belief, and against his conscience. See the learned Dr. JORTIN's *Life of ERASMUS*, vol. ii. p. 713. See also VITUS's account of the death of ECKIUS, in SECKENDORFF, *lib.* iii. p. 468, and in the *Scholia ad Indicem* 1 Hist. of the same Book, No XXIII.
 25, *add to the note*, as also in the *Wittenberg* edition of LUTHER's Works, vol. i, p. 336.
 26, after *note* [g], *add*, See SCHELHORNII *Amoenit. Hist. Eccles. & Lit.* vol. ii, p. 609. And after p. 8, &c. in the last line of the page, *add* JURIEU, *Apologie pour les Reformateurs*, &c. partie i, p. 119.
 28, l. penult, after LUTHER, *add this note*: This judicious distinction has not been sufficiently attended to; and the Romanists, some through artifice, others through ignorance, have confounded the papacy with the catholic church; though they be, in reality, two different things. The papacy indeed, by the ambitious dexterity of the Roman pontiffs, incorporated itself by degrees into the church; but it was a preposterous supplement, and was really as foreign to its genuine constitution, as a new citadel, erected by a successful usurper, would be to an ancient city. LUTHER set out and acted upon this distinction; he went out of the citadel, but he meant to remain in the city, and, like a good patriot, designed to reform its corrupted government.
 35, at the end of *note* [a], *add*, It appears from this representation (which is a just one) of the sentiments of ZUINGLE concerning the Holy Sacrament of the

the Lord's Supper, that they were the same with those maintained by Bishop HOADLEY, in his *Plain Account of the Nature and Design of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*.

P. 49, l. 7, for danger, read, various perils.

51, after note [e], add, It is however remarkable, that though BUCER composed a separate *Remonstrance*, yet his name appears among the subscribers at *Smalcald*, in the year 1537, to the confession of *Augsburg*, and to MELANTHON's defence of it.

59, note [w], l. 4, for three, read, five.

74, dele the note [y], and insert See APPENDIX, N^o I.

94, note, l. 11, for GEEDES, read, GEDDES.

97, at the end of note, add as follows: But the licentious exploits of this pope do not end here. He was reproached, in a book published before his death under the name of OCHINO, with having poisoned his mother and his nephew; with having ravished a young virgin at *Ancona*; with an incestuous and adulterous commerce with his daughter CONSTANTIA, who died of poison administered by the pope, to prevent any interruption of his odious amours. It is said, in the same book, that being caught in bed with his niece LAURA FARNESE, who was the wife of NIC. QUERCEI, he received from this incensed husband a stab of a dagger, of which he bore the marks to his death. See SLEIDAN, *Comment. de Statu Relig. et Reipublicæ Carolo Quinto Cæsare*, lib. xxi, p. 667, edit. *Argentor*.

103, l. 12, for 1543, read, 1563.

104, l. 102, for contribute, read, contributes.

105, l. 31, for CHOCLÆUS, read, COCHLÆUS.

108, note, l. 11, for purgatory, read, purgatory.

109, dele the note [l]; and, after note [m], add, Nor is it strictly true, that the *Vulgate* was declared by this council as a production beyond the reach of criticism or censure; since, as we learn from FRA-PAOLO, it was determined that this version should be corrected, and a

VOL. III.

new edition of it published by persons appointed for that purpose (see FRA-PAOLO SARPI's *History of the Council of Trent*, book ii, par. liii, and Dr. COUR-RAYER's French translation of this history, vol. i, p. 284, note 29.) There was, indeed, something highly ridiculous in the proceedings of the council in relation to this point; for, if the natural order of things had been observed, the revival and correction of the *Vulgate* would have preceded the pompous approbation, with which the council honoured and, as it were, consecrated that ancient version. For how, with any shadow of good sense, could the assembled fathers set the seal of their approbation to a work, which they acknowledged to stand in need of correction, and that before they knew whether or not the correction would answer their views and merit their approbation?

In the same page, after doctors, in l. 33, add this note: It is remarkable, that this prohibition extends even to such interpretations as were not designed for public view: *Etiam si hujusmodi interpretationes nullo unquam tempore in lucem edenda forent*. Sessio 4ta, tit. cap. ii.

120, note, l. ult. for impartiality, read, partiality.

135, l. 10, after Armenians, add a reference to the note [q].

138, dele note [c], and insert See the preceding note.

139, l. 1, after solemnity, add this note: The *Mendæans* perform these ablutions only once in a year. See MOSHEIM, *de Rebus Christian. ante CONST. MAG.* Comment. p. 45.

154, l. 32, after Magdeburgenses, add this note: The joint authors of this famous work (besides FLACIUS ILLYRICUS, were NICOLAUS GALLUS, JOHANNES WIGANDUS, and MATTHIAS JUDEX, all ministers of *Magdeburg*; and they were assisted by CASPAR NID-PRUCKIUS, an imperial counsellor, JOHANNES BAPTISTA HEINCELIUS, an Augustinian, BASIL FABER, and others.

155, l. 17, dele the second the.

L

P. 160,

VOL. II.

P. 160, l. 13, for dody, read, body.

170, note, l. 1, for [p], read, [q].

188, l. 11, after government, add, (See the end of this volume, p. 573, note [y].)

189, l. 18, after Christians, add this note: This assertion is equivocal. Many members of the church of England, with Archbishop LAUD at their head, did, indeed, propagate the doctrines of ARMINIUS, both in their pulpits and in their writings. But it is not accurate to say that the Church of England renounced publicly in that reign the opinions of CALVIN. See this matter further discussed, in a long note added to p. 496.

192, at the bottom of note [a], add: ERASMUS also spoke in a very unfriendly manner of the death of ZUINGLE and his friend OECOLAMPADIUS. See JORTIN'S *Life of ERASMUS*, vol. i, p. 522. It is not therefore surprizing to find the bigoted Sir THOMAS MORE insulting (with the barbarity that superstition seldom fails to produce in a narrow and peevish mind) the memory of these two eminent Reformers in a letter to the furious and turbulent COCHLAÆUS; of which the following words shew the spirit of the writer: "Postrema ea fuit, quam de ZUINGLIO & OECOLAMPADIO scriptam misisti, quorum nunciata mors mihi lætitiā attulit.—Sublatos e medio esse tam immanes Fidei Christianæ hostes, tam intentos ubique in omnem perimendæ pietatis occasionem, jure gaudere possum." JORTIN, *ibid.* vol. ii, p. 702, App. No. xvi, N.

205, at the end of note [k], add: It is, however, a piece of justice due to the memory of the excellent MELANCTHON, to observe, that he warmly condemned this uncharitable treatment, and more especially the indecent reproaches, which the Lutherans cast upon the English Martyrs who had sealed the Reformation with their blood, calling them the Devils Martyrs. *Vociferantur quidam* (says this amiable Reformer) *Martyres Anglicos esse Martyres Diaboli. Nolim hac contumelia afficere sanctum spi-*

ritum in LATIMERO, qui annum octogessimum egressus fuit, et in aliis sanctis viris, quos novi. These are the words of this truly Christian Reformer, in one of his letters to CAMERARIUS, *Epist.* lib. iv, p. 959, and in another of his letters, speaking of the burning of BURGIIUS at Paris, he thus severely censures WESTPHAL'S intolerable principles: *Tales viros ait WESTPHALUS esse Diaboli Martyres. Hanc judicii perversitatem quis non detestetur?* *Ep.* lib. ii, p. 387. Such were the humane and liberal sentiments of MELANCTHON, which have rendered his name so precious to the lovers of piety, probity, and moderation; while the zealous of his own church have treated his memory with obloquy, and composed dissertations *de Indifferentismo MELANCTHONIS*. N.

213, delete the note [w].

225, delete the last sentence of note [m].

231, l. 7, after year 1564, add this note:

OCHINUS did not leave the accusations of his adversaries without a reply; he published, in Italian, five Books of *Apology* for his character and conduct, which were printed, together with a Latin translation of them by SEB. CASTALIO, without the date of the year. The Geneva edition of this apology bears date 1554, and is in 8vo. There is a German edition in 4to, published (according to VOGTIUS, *Catal. Lib. rar.* p. 430) in the year 1556. That copy in the Jena library bears date 1559. See MYLIUS'S *Memor. Acad. Jenens.* C. 6, p. 430. BEZA, in his letter to DUDITHIUS, insults the memory of OCHINUS, and pretends to justify the severity with which he was treated, in such a taunting and uncharitable manner, as does him little credit. See his *Epist. Theolog. Genevæ*, 1575, in 12mo: epist. 1, p. 10, & epist. 81. What the writers of the Romish church have laid to the charge of OCHINUS, may be seen in the *Life of Cardinal COMMENDONI*, written by GRATIANI Bishop of Amelia (and published in a French translation by the eloquent FLECHIER, Bishop of Nismes), B. ii, C. 9, p. 128—149. N.

- P. 261, *dele the last sentence of note [e].*
 267, note, l. 5. *for Pina, read, Tina.*
 274, l. 5, *dele happily.*
 275, note, l. 1, *dele The learned and judicious.*
 290, *after note [m], add, See also LOCKMAN's Travels of the Jesuits, &c. translated from the Lettres Edifiantes, &c. vol. i, p. 4—9, 2d edit.*
 295, *after note [t], add, This History was translated into English, and published in the year 1750, with this title: Authentic Memoirs of the Christian church in China.*
 297, l. 8, *after bishop, add of Conon; and, l. 22, after reproaches, add: See the Lettre de Messieurs des Missions Etrangères au Pape sur les Idolatries & les Superstitions Chinoises—Revocation de l'Approbation donnée en 1687, par M. BRISACIER, Supérieur des Missions Etrangères au Livre de la Defense des nouveaux Chrétiens & des Missionnaires de la Chine.—Deux Lettres d'un Docteur de St. DOMINIQUE, au R. P. DEZ, Provincial des Jesuites, sur les Ceremonies de la Chine. These tracts are all printed together in one volume, 12mo, without any date or name of the place where published, though the treatises themselves are all dated 1700. N.*
 303, l. 5, *dele that they.*
 304, note, l. 1, *for KENNET's, read, HUMPHREYS's.*
 305, l. 5, 6, *for Be that as it may, whatever progress Christianity made, read, Any progress that Christianity made; and note, l. 5, 6, for nor does LABAT, read, nor are they mentioned by LABAT.*
 307, note, l. 29, *after represented, add, MURATORI's account of the mission of Paraguay was translated from the French edition into English, and published in 8vo, in the year 1759; l. 35, dele the second and; l. 30, before of carrying, add, accused.*
 309, *after note [t], add: INCREASE MATHER's Letter to LEUSDEN is translated into English, and inserted into COTTON MATHER's Life of ELLIOT, p. 94, (3d London edit.) and in his History of New England, book iii, p. 194. N.*

- 310, *after note [x], add: But, above all, the late learned Dr. BIRCH's Life of BOYLE, published in 8vo in the year 1744, and that very valuable collection of lives, the Biographia Britannica, article, BOYLE (ROBERT), note [z]. See also article HOBBS in the same collection. N.*
 314, note, l. 53, *for like their neighbours, read, even against reason.*
 316, l. 16, *for external, read, eternal.*
 317, l. 5, *for professed, read, possessed.*
 319, note, l. 26, *after done, add, with respect to the doctrines of the Gospel.*
 321, l. 8, *for GASCENDI, read, GASSENDI.*
 325, note, l. 19, *for p. 390, read, p. 308; and l. 22, for MONLERI, read, MOL-LERI.*
 328, l. 32, *after again, add, they considered as.*
 330, note, l. 8. *for detected, read, unmasked.*
 332, l. 21, *for zealous, read, jealous.*
 334, *adde note [x]: HUET's book concerning the Weakness of Human Reason was published after his death, in French, at Amsterdam, in the year 1723, and lately in Latin. It appears, however, that this eminent writer had, long before the composition of this book, recommended the sceptical method of conducting philosophical researches, and looked upon this method as the best adapted to establish the truth of Christianity upon solid foundations. See the Commentarius de Rebus ad eum pertinentibus, lib. iv, p. 230, and Demonstrat. Evangelicæ, Præfat. sect. iv. p. 9, where he commends their manner of proceeding, who, by sceptical arguments, invalidate all philosophical principles, before they begin to prove the truth of Christianity to those who doubt of its evidence. It is well known, that the Jesuits, who were particularly favoured by HUET, have, on many occasions, employed this method to throw dust into the eyes of the Protestants, and thus lead them blindfold into the Romish communion, and that they still continue to practise the same insidious instrument of seduction.*

ADDITIONS, &c. TO MOSHEIM'S

P. 335, l. 19, for this, read, his.

336, l. 3, for The, read, An; and l. ult. for BOUGEAN, read, BOUGEANT.

337, after note [g], add: The craft and dissimulation, attributed to this pontif, really constituted an essential part of his character; but it is not strictly true that he was a man of a mean genius, or unequal to great and difficult undertakings. He was a man of learning, and discovered very eminent abilities at the treaty of *Munster*, where he was sent in the character of nuncio. Some writers relate, that, while he was in *Germany*, he had formed the design of abjuring Popery and embracing the Protestant religion; but was deterred from the execution of this purpose by the example of his cousin, Count POMPEY, who was poisoned at *Lyons*, on his way to *Germany*, after he had abjured the *Romish* faith. These writers add, that CHIGI was confirmed in his religion by his elevation to the Cardinalship. See BAYLE *Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lettres*, Octob. 1688.

342, l. 25, after suggest, add this note: When the consequences of these iniquitous and barbarous proceedings were represented to this Emperor, and he was assured that the country must be utterly ruined, in case the *Bohemians*, rendered desperate by his enormous cruelty and oppression, should exert themselves in defence of their liberties, and endeavour to repel force by force; he is reported to have answered with great zeal and calmness, *Malum Regnum vastatum, quam damnatum*. See the *Historia Persecutionum Ecclesie Bohemicæ*, &c. p. 152, a work published (probably in *Holland*, as would seem by the type) in the year 1648, in 24°. This little book contains an ample recital of the deplorable effects of lawless power, inhuman bigotry, and blood-thirsty zeal, and proves, by numberless facts, that Dr. MOSHEIM had the strongest evidences for the account he gives of FERDINAND and his missionaries. It is impossible to reflect upon the sanguinary manner of such converters, without expressing, at the same

time, a generous detestation and abhorrence of their unjust and violent proceedings. N.

346, l. 28, after excessive, add, and intolerable; and read the last sentence of note [g] thus: See the *Papers* relating to the Popish Plot, published by the orders of Secretary CONWAY.

347, l. 4, after imprudent, add, and bigoted; and l. 21, after Popery, add this note: Such is the representation given of CHARLES II, by all historians, so that Dr. MOSHEIM is excusable in mistaking a part of this monarch's character, which was known to very few before him. Mr. HUME, whose history of the reign of that Prince is a master-piece in every respect, gave a like account of CHARLES as fluctuating between Deism and Popery. But this eminent historian, having had occasion, during his residence at *Paris*, to peruse the manuscript memoirs of King JAMES II, which were written by himself, and are kept in the *Scots* college there, received from them new information with respect to the religious character of CHARLES, and was convinced that his zeal for Popery went much further than has been generally imagined, for it appears, with the utmost evidence, from these memoirs, that the King had laid with his ministry a formal plan for subverting the constitution in favour of Popery, that the introduction of Popery, as the established religion, was the great and principal object which CHARLES had in view, when he entered into the *French* alliance, which was concluded at *Versailles* in the end of 1669, or beginning of 1670, by Lord ARUNDEL OF WARDOUR. By this treaty, LEWIS was to give CHARLES 200,000 pounds a year in quarterly payments in order to enable him to establish the Roman Catholic religion in *England*, and to supply him also with 6000 men in case of any insurrection. The division of *The United Provinces* between *England* and *France* was another article of this treaty. But we are told that the subversion of the Protestant religion

ligion in *England* was the point that CHARLES had chiefly at heart, and that he insisted warmly on beginning with the execution of this part of the treaty; but the Duchess of ORLEANS, in the interview at *Dover*, persuaded him to begin with the *Dutch* war. The King (says Mr. HUME) was so zealous a *Papist*, that he *wept* for joy when he entertained the project of re-uniting his kingdom to the catholic church. See the *Corrections and Additions* to Mr. HUME's *History of CHARLES II*, p. 238, in the note.

P. 348, l. 13, *after* experience, *read*, had; and, l. 36, *for* WOLFGANY, *read*, WOLFGANG.

349, l. 12, *for* 1685, *read*, 1683; and, l. 34, *after* things, *add* by.

350, *note*, l. 19, *after* LOUVAIN, *add*, in the year 1685, and declared to be scandalous and pernicious; and at the end of that note, *add*: See a very interesting account of this insidious work of BOSSUET, and the controversies it occasioned, in the *Bibliothèque des Sciences*, published at the *Hague*, vol. xviii, p. 20. This account, which is curious, accurate, ample, and learned, was given partly on occasion of a new edition of the *Exposition*, printed at *Paris* in 1761, and accompanied with a Latin translation done by FLEURY, and partly on occasion of BURIGNY's *Life of BOSSUET*, published the same year at *Paris*.

351, l. 33, *for* BLANE, *read*, BLANC; *note*, l. 2, *for* tom. i, p. 95, *read*, pars iii, p. 650, 662.

355, *note*, l. 19, *for* ARCKENHOLK, *read*, ARCKENHOLT.

359, at the end of note [w], *add*, The third book of LA CROZE's history, which relates to the progress and ruin of this mission, is translated by Mr. LOCKMAN into *English*, and inserted in *The Travels of the Jesuits*, vol. i. p. 308, &c. as also is PONCET's *Voyage*, mentioned in the following note.

Ibid. note [x], l. 14, *for* GRANE, *read*, GRAND; l. 15, *for* having mentioned, *read*, relating.

362, *note*, l. 20, *after* pass, *add* the.

364, l. 14, *after* necessity, *add* this note:

It is with a view to this that VOLTAIRE, speaking of the manner in which the court of *France* maintains its prerogatives against the *Roman* pontif, says pleasantly that the *King of France* *kisses the Pope's feet*, and *ties up his hands*.

369, l. 38, *for* are not observed, *read*, are infringed.

371, l. 24, *dele* even; and, l. 25, *after* divinely, *insert* even.

374, l. 14, *after* in, *add* the.

382, l. 1, *for* genius, *read*, industry.

385, l. 11, *for* void of, *read*, avoid; and, l. 17, *for* no such, *read*, so much.

386, *note*, l. 28, *for* thrown, *read*, printed.

388, l. 6, *for* it must be, *read*, it must not be; and *note*, l. ult. *for* that they aim at, *read*, at which they aim.

389, l. ult. *for* irreligion, *read*, religion.

390, l. 16, *for* Germans, *read*, German.

392, *note*, l. 7, *for* were, *read*, had been; and, l. 8, *for* were charged with, *read*, of.

393, l. 7, *for* its, *read*, the; l. 18, *after* system, *add*, than the publication of this book.

395, l. 11, *for* arts, *read*, acts; and *note*, l. 7, *for* Jansenismo, *read*, Jansenismi.

397, l. 13, *dele* in; and, l. 26, *dele* with inexcusable temerity.

399, l. 10, *for* publicly, *read*, openly.

400, *note*, l. 17, *for* VILLFORD, *read*, VILLEFORD.

401, *note*, l. 9, *for* certain, *read*, considerable.

403, l. 2, *for* in view, *read*, of view; l. 6, *after* are, *add* greatly, and, l. 17,

for Nay, they go still further, and maintain, *read*, Not satisfied with this fanatical language, they go still farther, and superstitiously maintain.

404, *note*, l. 22, *for* RABINE, *read*, RACINE.

406, l. 18, *for* shame, *read*, flame.

409, l. 20, *for* expel, *read*, dispel; l. 23, *for* detector, *read*, director; and, l. penult. *for* dictates, *read*, feelings.

412, *note*, l. 1, *for* relating, *read*, relative; and, at the end of the note, *add*: See more of this WHITE in WOOD's *Athen. Oxon.* 2d edit. vol. ii. p. 665, and.

ADDITIONS, &c. TO MOSHEIM'S

- and in the *Biograph. Brit.* article GLAN-
VIL, vol. iv. p. 2206,
P. 418, *note*, l. 3, for this transactions of
the, *read*, the transactions of this.
419, l. 18, for Be that as it will, it may
justly be, *read*, Granting all this to be
true, it may nevertheless be justly;
and, l. 25, for many, *read*, several.
425, l. 4, for PAUL IV, *read*, PAUL V.
426, l. ult. for religions, *read*, religious.
428, for a point of light somewhat differ-
ent from this, *read*, a different point
of light; and, l. 30, for favour, *read*,
faith.
432, l. 11, for Marpung, *read*, Marpurg.
439, l. 10, for pefect, *read*, perfect.
441, l. 19, after may, *read*, also.
444, l. 19, for attention, *read*, inatten-
tion.
446, l. 28, *dele* other; and, after tribu-
nals, *add* were.
454, l. 16, for are, *read*, were.
460, l. 29, for of the true, *read*, of true;
and, l. 40, for institution, *read*, insti-
tutions.
462, l. 14, for the romantic, *read*, the
most romantic.
465, l. 21, for Be that as it may, *read*,
However that may have been.
469, at the end of *note* [b], *add*: BEHMEN,
however, had the good fortune to meet
with, in our days, a warm advocate
and an industrious disciple in the late
well-meaning but gloomy and visionary
Mr. WILLIAM LAW, who was, for ma-
ny years, preparing a new edition and
translation of BEHMEN's works, which
he left behind him ready for the press,
and which have been published in two
volumes quarto since his decease. N.
470, l. 8, for of speaking, *read*, in
speaking.
471, l. 30, after years, *add*, reign.
472, after *note* [l], *add*: Our author,
probably meant, that the part of SEIDEL's
doctrine, which represents CHRIST's
mission as only designed to republish and
interpret the law of nature, and the
whole religious and moral duty of man
as consisting in an obedience to this
law, would have been well received by
many persons in Great Britain and
Holland; but he should have said so;
nothing requires such precision as ac-
cusations.
Ibid. l. ult. after worship, *add*: See here-
after, p. 573, notes [x] and [y].
474, l. 28, 29, after strong-holds, *read*,
and before their rights and privileges,
together with their ecclesiastical polity.
477, at the end of *note* [g], *add*: See also
a pamphlet intituled, *An Account of the
late Persecutions of the Waldenses by the
Duke of Savoy and the French King in the
year 1686*, published at Oxford, in 4to,
1688. See likewise a particular detail
of the miseries endured by these unfor-
tunate objects of Papal persecution, in
the years 1655, 1662, 1663 and 1686,
related by PETER BOYER, in his *History
of the Vaudois*, chap. 12—21, p. 72,
&c.
479, l. 22, for Tustament, *read*, Testa-
ment; and, l. penult. before appeared,
add, they.
480, l. 13, for collected into, *read*, re-
presented it.
481, l. 37, for PILTET, *read*, PICTET.
486, l. 8, after nature, *add this note*:
It does not appear to me, that any one
who looks with an unprejudiced eye,
can see the least connexion between the
opinion of PISCATOR (which I shall not
here either refute or defend) and the
Popish doctrine, which maintains the
merit of good works; for though we are
not justified (*i. e.* pardoned, or treated
as if we had not offended) in conse-
quence of CHRIST's active obedience
to the Divine Law, yet we may be so
by his death and sufferings; and it is
really to these that the Scriptures, in
many places, ascribe our acceptance.
Now a person who ascribes his accept-
ance and salvation to the death and me-
diation of CHRIST, does not surely give
any countenance to the doctrine of the
strict and rigorous merit of works, al-
though he should not be so sharp-sighted
as to perceive the influence which cer-
tain doctors attribute to what is called,
CHRIST's active obedience. But let it be
observed here, in a particular manner,
that the opinion of PISCATOR is much
more unfavourable to Popery, than our
author imagined, since it overturns to-
tally,

tally, by a direct and most natural consequence, the Popish doctrine concerning *works of supererogation*, which is as monstrous an absurdity in morals, as transubstantiation is in the estimation of common sense. For, if CHRIST in his *universal* and *perfect* obedience to the Divine Laws did no more than he was *morally obliged* to do by his character as a *man*, is it not absurd, if not impious, to seek in the virtue of the *Romish* saints (all of whom were very imperfect, and some of them very worthless mortals) an exuberance of obedience, a *superabundant* quantity of virtue, to which they were not obliged, and which they are supposed to deposit in the hands of the Popes, who are empowered to distribute it, for love or money, among such as have need of it to make up their accounts?

P. 487, after note [1], add: This mitigated view of the doctrine of predestination has only one defect; but it is a capital one. It represents GOD as *desiring* a thing (*i. e.* salvation and happiness) for ALL, which in order to its attainment requires a *degree* of his assistance and succour which he *refuseth* to MANY. This rendered grace and redemption *universal* only in words, but *partial* in reality, and therefore did not, at all, mend the matter. The *Supralapsarians* were consistent with themselves, but their doctrine was harsh and terrible, and was founded on the most unworthy notions of the Supreme Being; and, on the other hand, the system of AMIRAUT was full of inconsistencies; nay, even the *Sublapsarian* doctrine has its difficulties, and rather palliates, than removes the horrors of *Supralapsarianism*. What then is to be done?—from what quarter shall the candid and well-disposed Christian receive that solid satisfaction and wise direction, which neither of these systems is adapted to administer? These he will receive by turning his dazzled and feeble eye from the *secret* decrees of GOD, which were neither designed to be *rules* of action, nor *sources* of comfort to mortals here below, and by fixing his view upon the

mercy of GOD, as it is manifested through CHRIST, the pure laws and sublime promises of his Gospel, and the respectable equity of his present government and his future tribunal.

488, l. 16, for *from*, read, could they prevent it.

493, at the end of note [f], add: It is certain, that nothing can be more unjust and partial than CLARENDON's account of this eminent prelate, particularly, when he says that *he neither understood nor regarded the constitution of the church*. But it is too much the custom of this writer, and others of his stamp, to give the denomination of latitudinarian indifference to that charity, prudence, and moderation by which alone the *best interests* of the church (though not the personal views of many of its ambitious members) can be established upon *firm* and *permanent* foundations. ABBOT would have been reckoned a good church-man by some, if he had breathed that spirit of despotism and violence, which being essentially incompatible with the spirit and character of a people not only free, but jealous of their liberty, has often endangered the church, by exciting that resentment which always renders opposition excessive. ABBOT was so far from being indifferent about the *constitution of the church*, or inclined to the *Presbyterian discipline* (as this noble author affirms in his *History of the Rebellion*), that it was by his zeal and dexterity, that the clergy of *Scotland*, who had refused to admit the bishops as moderators in their church synods, were brought to a more tractable temper, and things put into such a situation, as afterwards produced the intire establishment of the episcopal order in that nation. It is true, that ABBOT's zeal in this affair was conducted with great prudence and moderation, and it was by these that his zeal was rendered successful. Nor have these his transactions in *Scotland*, where he went as chaplain to the Lord High-treasurer DUNBAR, been sufficiently attended to by historians; nay, they seem to have been

been intirely unknown by some, who have pretended to appreciate the conduct and principles of this virtuous and excellent prelate. King JAMES, who had been so zealous a Presbyterian, in appearance, before his accession to the crown of *England*, had scarcely set his foot out of *Scotland*, when he conceived the design of restoring the ancient form of episcopal government in that kingdom, and it was ABBOT's transactions there that brought him to that high favour with the King, which, in the space of little more than three years, raised him from the deanry of *Winchester* to the see of *Canterbury*. For it was by ABBOT's mild and prudent counsels, that DUNBAR procured that famous act of the general assembly of *Scotland*, by which it was provided, "that the King should have the calling of all general assemblies;—that the bishops (or —their deputies) should be perpetual moderators of the diocesan synods; that no excommunication should be pronounced without their approbation;—that all presentations of benefices should be made by them;—that the deprivation or suspension of ministers should belong to them;—that the visitation of the diocese should be performed by the bishop, or his deputy only; and that the bishop should be moderator of all conventions, for exercising or prophesying (i.e. preaching) within their bounds." See CALDERWOOD's *True History of the Church of Scotland*, fol. 1680, 588, 589; HEYLIN's *History of the Presbyterians*, p. 381, 382; and, above all, SPEED's *History of Great Britain*, book x, fol. 1227. The writers, who seem the least disposed to speak favourably of this wise and good prelate, bear testimony, nevertheless, to his eminent piety, his exemplary conversation, and his inflexible probity and integrity. And it may be said with truth, that if his moderate measures had been pursued, the liberties of *England* would have been secured, Popery discountenanced, and the church prevented from running

into those excesses, which afterwards proved so fatal to it. If ABBOT's candour failed him on any occasion, it was in the representations which his rigid attachment, not to the discipline, but to the doctrinal tenets of Calvinism, led him to give of the Arminian doctors. There is a remarkable instance of this in a letter of his to Sir RALPH WINWOOD, dated at *Lambeth*, the first of June, 1613, and occasioned by the arrival of GROTIUS in *England*, who had been expressly sent from *Holland* by the Remonstrants, or Arminians, to mitigate the King's displeasure and antipathy against that party. In this letter the Archbishop represents GROTIUS (with whom he certainly was not worthy to be named, either in point of learning, sagacity, or judgement) as a pedant, and mentions, with a high degree of complacence and approbation, the absurd and impertinent judgment of some civilians and divines, who called this immortal ornament of the republic of letters, a smatterer, and a simple fellow. See WINWOOD's *Memorials*, vol. iii, p. 459.

494, note [i], l. 12, after mention, add, p. 36; and, at the end of the note, add: See also an extract of a letter from TOBIE MATTHEW, D. D. Dean of *Durham*, to the Lord Treasurer BURLEIGH, containing an information of Scotch affairs, in STRYPE's *Annals*, vol. iv, p. 201. Above all, see HARRIS's *Historical and Critical Account of the Life and Writings of JAMES I*, p. 29, note (N). This last writer may be added to LARREY and RAPIN, who have exposed the pliability and inconsistency of this self-sufficient monarch.

495, l. 32, for excessive, read, rigid.

496, l. 39, for us, read, them; 4. 40, before forget, add, they; and, at the end of note [m], add: This expression may lead the uninformed reader into a mistake, and make him imagine that LAUD had caused the Calvinistical doctrine of thirty-nine articles to be abrogated, and the tenets of ARMINIUS to be substituted in their place. It may

may therefore be proper to set this matter in a clearer light. In the year 1625, LAUD wrote a small treatise to prove the orthodoxy of the Arminian doctrines; and, by his credit with the Duke of BUCKINGHAM, had Arminian and Antipuritanical chaplains placed about the King. This step increased the debates between the Calvinistical and Arminian doctors, and produced the warmest animosities and dissensions. To calm these, the King issued out a proclamation, dated the 14th of January, 1626, the literal tenour of which was, in truth, more favourable to the Calvinists than to the Arminians; though, by the manner in which it was interpreted and executed by LAUD, it was turned to the advantage of the latter. In this proclamation it was said expressly, that his Majesty would "admit of no innovations in the doctrine, discipline, or government of the church (N. B. *the doctrine of the church previously to this was Calvinistical*)," and therefore charges all his subjects, and especially the clergy, "not to publish or maintain in preaching or writing, any *new inventions* or *opinions*, contrary to the said doctrine and discipline established by law, &c." It was certainly a very singular instance of LAUD's indecent partiality, that this proclamation was employed to suppress the books that were expressly written in defence of the thirty-nine articles, while the writings of the Arminians, who certainly opposed these articles, were publicly licensed. I do not here enter into the merits of the cause; I only speak of the tenour of the proclamation, and the manner of its execution.

This manner of proceeding shewed how difficult and arduous a thing it is to change systems of doctrine established by law, since neither CHARLES, who was by no means diffident of his authority, nor LAUD, who was far from being timorous in the use and abuse of it, attempted to reform articles of faith, that stood in direct opposition to the Arminian doctrines, which they were

VOL. III.

now promoting by the warmest encouragements, and which were daily gaining ground under their protection. Instead of reforming the thirty-nine articles, which step would have met with great opposition from the House of Commons, and from a considerable part of the clergy and laity, who were still warmly attached to Calvinism, LAUD advised the King to have these articles re-printed, with an ambiguous *declaration* prefixed to them, which might tend to silence or discourage the reigning controversies between the Calvinists and Arminians, and thus secure to the latter an unmolested state, in which they would daily find their power growing, under the countenance and protection of the court. This *declaration*, which, in most editions of the Common-prayer, is still to be found at the head of the articles, is a most curious piece of political theology; and had it not borne hard upon the right of private judgment, and been evidently designed to favour one party though it carried the aspect of a perfect neutrality, it might have been looked upon as a wise and provident measure, to secure the tranquillity of the church. For in the tenour of this *declaration*, precision was sacrificed to prudence; and ambiguity, nay, even contradictions were preferred before consistent, clear, and positive decisions, that might have fomented dissensions and discord. The declaration seemed to favour the Calvinists, since it prohibited the *affixing any new sense to any article*; it also favoured, in effect, the Arminians, as it ordered all *curious search, about the contested points, to be laid aside, and these disputes to be shut up in God's promises as they are generally set forth to us in Holy Scriptures, and the general meaning of the articles of the church of England according to them*. But what was singularly preposterous in this declaration, was its being designed to favour the Arminians, and yet prohibiting expressly any person, either in their sermons or writings, *to put his own sense or comment to be the meaning of the article,*

M

and

and ordering them, on the contrary, to take each article in its literal and grammatical sense, and to submit to it in the full and plain meaning thereof; for certainly if the seventeenth article has a plain, literal, and grammatical meaning, it is a meaning unfavourable to Arminianism; and Bishop BURNET was obliged afterwards to acknowledge, that without enlarging the sense of the articles, the Arminians could not subscribe them consistently with their opinions, nor without violating the demands of common ingenuity. See BURNET'S *Remarks on the Examination of his Exposition*, &c. p. 3.

This renders it probable, that the declaration now mentioned (in which we see no royal signature, no attestation of any officer of the crown, no date, in short, no mark to shew where, when, or by what authority it was issued out) was not composed in the reign of King CHARLES. Bishop BURNET, indeed, was of opinion that it was composed in that reign to support the Arminians, who, when they were charged with departing from the true sense of the articles, answered, "that they took the articles in their literal and grammatical sense, and therefore did not prevaricate." But this reasoning does not appear conclusive to the acute and learned author of the *Confessional*. He thinks it more probable, that the declaration was composed and first published in the latter part of King JAMES's reign; for though, says he, there be no evidence that JAMES ever turned Arminian in principle, yet that was the party that stuck to him in his measures, and which it became necessary for him on that account to humour, and to render respectable in the eyes of the people, by every expedient, that might not bring any reflexion on his own consistency. "And whoever, continues this author, considers the quibbling and equivocal terms in which this instrument is drawn, will, I am persuaded, observe the distress of a man divided between his principles and his interests, that is,

"of a man exactly in the situation of King JAMES I, in the three last years of his reign." It is likely, then, that this declaration was only re-published at the head of the articles, which were re-printed by the order of CHARLES I.

501, l. 33, after England, add this note: In the year 1616, Mr. JACOB, who adopted the religious sentiments of ROBINSON, set up the first Independent or Congregational church in England.

504, l. 16, for erected, read, elected.

505, at the end of note [b], add: I have been informed, since the first edition of this history was published, that the book, intituled, *Examen des défauts Theologiques*, which our author supposes to have been written by Dr. COURRAYER, is the production of another pen.

506, at the end of note [d], add: See an admirable defence of the latitudinarian divines, in a book, intituled, *The Principles and Practices of certain Moderate Divines of the Church of England* (greatly misunderstood) truly represented and defended. London, 1670, in 8vo. This book was written by Dr. FOWLER, afterwards Bishop of Gloucester. N.

507, l. 25, for eight, read, seven; and add this note: The other Non-juring bishops were, Dr. LLOYD, Bishop of Norwich; Dr. TURNER, of Ely; Dr. KENN, of Bath and Wells; Dr. FRAMPTON, of Gloucester; Dr. THOMAS, of Worcester; Dr. LAKE, of Chichester; Dr. WHITE, of Peterborough.

Ibid. l. 34, after merit, add this note: These were, TILLOTSON, MOORE, PATRICK, KIDDER, FOWLER, and CUMBERLAND, names that will be ever pronounced with veneration by such as are capable of esteeming solid, well-employed learning, and genuine piety, and that will always shine among the brightest ornaments of the church of England.

508, read note [l] thus: DODWELL himself was deprived of his professorship of history for refusing to take the oaths of allegiance to King WILLIAM and Queen MARY; and this circumstance, no doubt, augmented the zeal with which

which he interested himself in the defence of the bishops, who were suspended for the same reason. It was on this occasion, that he published his *Cautionary Discourse of Schism, with a particular regard to the Case of the Bishops who are suspended for refusing to take the new oath*. This book was fully refuted by the learned Dr. HODY, in the year 1691, in a work intituled: *The Unreasonableness of a Separation from the New Bishops: Or, a Treatise out of Ecclesiastical History, shewing, that although a Bishop was unjustly deprived, neither he nor the church ever made a separation, if the successor was not a heretick*; translated out of an ancient Greek Manuscript (viz. among the Baroccian MSS.) in the Public Library at Oxford. The learned author translated this work afterwards into Latin, and prefixed to it some pieces out of ecclesiastical antiquity, relative to the same subject. DODWELL published, in 1692, an answer to it, which he called *A Vindication of the deprived Bishops, &c.* to which Dr. HODY replied in a treatise, intituled, *The Case of the Sees vacant by an unjust or uncanonical Deprivation, stated: in Reply to the Vindication, &c.* The controversy did not end here; and it was the hardest thing in the world to reduce Mr. Dodwell to silence. Accordingly he came forth a third time with his stiff and rigid polemics, and published, in 1695, his *Defence of the Vindication of the deprived Bishops*. The preface, which he designed to prefix to this work, was at first suppressed; but appeared afterwards under the following title: *The Doctrine of the Church of England concerning the Independency of the Clergy on the Lay-power, as to those Rights of theirs which are purely spiritual, reconciled with our Oath of Supremacy and the Lay-deprivation of the Popish Bishops in the beginning of the Reformation*. Several other pamphlets were published on the subject of this controversy.

514, l. 28, after truth, add this note: This affirmation is somewhat exaggerated; at least, we must not conclude from it, that ROELL was either deposed

or persecuted; for he exercised the functions of his professorship for several years after this at *Franecker*, and was afterwards called to the chair of divinity at *Utrecht*, and that upon the most honourable and advantageous terms. The States of *Friesland* published an edict enjoining silence, and forbidding all professors, pastors, &c. in their province to teach the particular opinions of ROELL; and this pacific divine sacrificed the propagation of his opinions to the love of peace and concord. His notion concerning the Trinity did not essentially differ from the doctrine generally received upon that mysterious and unintelligible subject; and his design seemed to be no more than to prevent Christians from *humanizing* the relation between the *Father* and the *Son*. But this was wounding his brethren, the rigorous systematic divines, in a tender point; for if *Anthropomorphism*, or the custom of attributing to the Deity the kind of procedure, in acting and judging, that is usual among men (who resemble him only as imperfection resembles perfection), was banished from theology, orthodoxy would be deprived of some of its most precious phrases, and our confessions of faith and systems of doctrine would be reduced within much narrower bounds.

515, dele the note [u], and read thus: Our historian relates here somewhat obscurely the reasoning, which BEKKER founded upon the Cartesian definition of mind or spirit. The tenour and amount of his argument is as follows: "The essence of mind is *thought*, and "the essence of matter is *extension*.—" "Now since there is no sort of conformity or connexion between *thought* "and *extension*, mind cannot act upon "matter unless these two substances be "united, as soul and body are in man: "—therefore no separate spirits, either "good or evil, can act upon mankind. "Such acting is *miraculous*, and miracles can be performed by GOD alone. "It follows of consequence, that the "Scripture accounts of the actions and "operations of good and evil spirits must
M 2 " be

ADDITIONS, &c. TO MOSHEIM'S

"be understood in an allegorical sense."

This is BEKKER's argument; and it does, in truth, little honour to his acuteness and sagacity. By proving too much, it proves nothing at all; for if the want of a connexion or conformity between thought and extension renders mind incapable of acting upon matter, it is hard to see how their union should remove this incapacity, since the want of conformity and connexion remains notwithstanding this union. Besides, according to this reasoning, the Supreme Being cannot act upon material beings. In vain does BEKKER maintain the affirmative, by having recourse to a miracle; for this would imply, that the whole course of nature was a series of miracles, that is to say, that there are no miracles at all.

P. 519, note [d], l. 4. for UYTENBOUARD's, read, UYTENBOGARD's; and, l. 6, for progrusse, read, progressu.

522, l. 12, after church, add this note: This is a curious remark. It would seem as if the Lutherans were not Semi-pelagians; as if they considered man as absolutely *passive* in the work of his conversion and sanctification; but such an opinion surely has never been the general doctrine of the Lutheran church, however rigorously LUTHER may have expressed himself on that head in some unguarded moments; more especially it may be affirmed, that in later times the Lutherans are, to a man, Semi-pelagians; and let it not be thought, that this is imputed to them as a reproach.

523, at the end of note [k], add: There appeared in *Holland* a warm vindication of the memory of this great man, in a work published at *Delft*, in 1727, and intituled; *Grotii Manes ab iniquis obtreptionibus vindicati; accedit, Scripturum ejus, tum editorum tum ineditorum, Conspectus Triplex.*

524, note, l. 4, for where, read, were.

Ibid. dele note [m], and read thus: The Calvinists are not particular in this; and indeed it is natural, that debates purely theological should be discussed in an assembly of divines.

Ibid. after note [n], add: The legitimacy of the manner of convoking this synod, was questioned by OLDEN BARNEVELT, who maintained that the States-general had no sort of authority in matters of religion, not even the power of assembling a synod, affirming that this was an act of sovereignty, that belonged to each province separately and respectively. See CARLETON's *Letters*, &c.

526, dele the note [r].

528, l. 3, 4, for they modified to their taste, and accommodated them to their theological system, read, they modified them considerably, and reduced them to an excessive degree of simplicity.

531, l. 28, after numerous, add this note:

It may not however be improper to observe here, that the progress of *Arminianism* has been greatly retarded; nay, that its cause daily declines in *Germany* and several parts of *Switzerland*, in consequence of the ascendant which the Leibnitian and Wolfian philosophy hath gained in these countries, particularly among the clergy and men of learning. LEIBNITZ and WOLF, by attacking that liberty of *indifference*, which is supposed to imply the power of acting not only *without*, but *against* motives, struck at the very foundation of the *Arminian* system. But this was not all: for by considering that multiplicity of worlds that compose the universe, as one *system* or *whole*, whose greatest possible *perfection* is the ULTIMATE END of creating goodness and the sovereign purpose of governing wisdom, they removed from the doctrine of *predestination* those arbitrary procedures and narrow views, with which the Calvinists are supposed to have loaded it, and gave it a new, a more pleasing, and a more philosophical aspect. As the Leibnitians laid down this great END, as the supreme object of God's universal dominion, and the scope to which *all* his dispensations are directed; so they concluded, that if this *end* was proposed, it *must* be accomplished. Hence the doctrine of necessity, to fulfil the purposes of a predestination, founded in wisdom and goodness; a necessity, *physical*

physical and mechanical in the motions of material and inanimate things, but a necessity, *moral and spiritual*, in the voluntary determinations of intelligent beings in consequence of prepollent motives, which produce their effects with *certainly*, though these effects be *contingent*, and by no means the offspring of an absolute and essentially immutable fatality. These principles are evidently applicable to the main doctrines of Calvinism; by them *predestination* is confirmed, though modified with respect to its reasons and its end; by them *irresistible grace* (irresistible in a moral sense) is maintained upon the hypothesis of prepollent motives and a moral necessity. The *perseverance of the saints* is also explicable upon the same system, by a series of moral causes producing a series of moral effects. In consequence of all this, several divines of the German church have applied the Leibnitian and Wolfian philosophy to the illustration of the doctrines of Christianity; and the learned CANZIUS has written a book expressly to shew the eminent use that may be made of that philosophy, in throwing light upon the chief articles of our faith. See his *Philosophiæ LEIBNITIANÆ & WOLFIANÆ Usus in Theologia per præcipua fidei capita*, Auctore ISRAEL THEOPH. CANZIO, and of which a second edition was published at Francfort and Leipzig, in 1749. See also WITTENBACH's *Tentamen Theologiæ Dogmaticæ Methodo Scientifica pertractatæ*, which was published in three volumes octavo, at Francfort, in 1747. See above all, the famous work of LEIBNITZ, intituled, *Essais de Théodicée, sur la Bonté de Dieu, la Liberté de l'Homme, & l'Origine du Mal*. — It is remarkable enough, that the Leibnitian system has been embraced by very few, scarcely by any, of the English Calvinists. Can this be owing to a want of inclination towards philosophical discussions? This cannot be said. The scheme of *necessity* and of *partial evil's tending to universal good*, has, indeed, been fostered in some parts of Great-Britain, and even has turned

some zealous Arminians into moderate and philosophical Calvinists. But the zealous Calvinists have, for the most part, held firm to their theology, and blended no philosophical principles with their system; and it is certain, that the most eminent philosophers have been found, generally speaking, among the Arminians. If both Calvinists and Arminians claim a KING; it is certain, that the latter alone can boast of a NEWTON, a LOCKE, a CLARK, and a BOYLE.

532, l. 21, after Fox, add this note: The anonymous writer of *A Letter to Dr. FORMEY*, F. R. S. published by NICOL, seems much offended at Mr. FORMEY, on account of his calling GEORGE FOX, a man of a *turbulent spirit*, &c. He tells us, on the contrary, that, from all the information worthy of credit, which he was able to procure, it appears, that Fox was “a man of so meek, contented, easy, steady, and tender a disposition, that it was a pleasure to be in his company;—that he exercised no authority but over evil, and that every where and in all, but with love, compassion, and long-suffering.” This account he takes from PENN; and it is very probable that he has looked no farther, unless it be to the curious portrait, which THOMAS ELLWOOD, another Quaker, has given of Fox, a portrait in which there is such an affected jingle of words, as shews the author to have been more attentive to the arrangement of his sentences, than to a true exhibition of the character of his original; for we are told by ELLWOOD, that this same GEORGE FOX was deep in divine knowledge, powerful in preaching, fervent in prayer, quick in discerning, sound in judgment (*risum teneatis, amici?*)—manly in personage, grave in gesture, courteous in conversation, weighty in communication, &c. &c. After having thus painted GEORGE after the fancy of his two brethren (for fancy is the Quakers fountain of light and truth) the letter-writer observes, that Dr. FORMEY has taken his account of GEORGE'S

ADDITIONS, &c. TO MOSHEIM'S

GEORGE's turbulence and fanaticism from MOSHEIM's *Ecclesiastical History*. As MOSHEIM then is dead, and cannot defend himself, may I be permitted to beg of this anonymous letter-writer, who appears to be a candid and rational man, to cast an eye upon SEWEL's *History of the Quakers*, and to follow this meek, courteous, and modest GEORGE running like a wild man through several counties, refusing homage to his sovereign, interrupting the ministers in the public celebration of divine service at Nottingham, Mansfield, and Market-Bosworth? It is remarkable, that the very learned and worthy Dr. HENRY MORE, who was not, himself, without a strong tincture of enthusiasm, and who looked upon PENN as a pious Christian, treated nevertheless GEORGE Fox as a melancholy fanatic, and as one possessed with the Devil. See his *Myst. of Godliness*, book x, chap. xiii; as also *Schol. in Dialogue v, sect. v.*

P. 533, note, l. 5, for ceile, read, celle. *Ibid.* at the end of note [k], add: See NEAL's *History of the Puritans — The Life and Trial of NAYLOR*, p. 6, 7, &c. The anonymous author of the *Letter to Dr. FORMEY*, F. R. S. seems to have lost sight of the state of Quakerism in the time of Fox, when he denies that the charge of turbulence and fanaticism can be proved against him or his friends, and gives the gentle denomination of *imprudence* to the extravagancies exhibited by the Quakers under CHARLES I, and the Commonwealth. The single story of NAYLOR, who was the convert and pupil of Fox, the letters, full of blasphemous absurdity, written to this *Rose of Sharon*, this *New Jesus*, by HANNAH STRANGER, RICHARD FAIRMAN, and others, shew the horrid vein of fanaticism that ran through this visionary sect. See these letters in the *Life and Trial of NAYLOR*, who, though cruelly scourged, was, however, whipped into his senses, or, at least, brought by his sufferings into a calmer state of mind. See also *Satan Enthroned*, &c. p. 4 and 5. If Quakerism be now in England on a more ra-

tional footing, we may congratulate its members upon the happy change; but, at the same time, condole with them on the approaching annihilation of their sect; for if *reason* gets in among them, the *spirit* (I mean *their spirit*) will soon be quenched, and fancy being no more the only criterion of truth, the fundamental principle of their existence will be destroyed. In such a catastrophe, the abettors of ancient Quakerism will find some resource among the Methodists.

543, l. ult. after silence, add this note: The truth of this account of *fixed speakers* appointed to discourse and exhort, when the spirit does not move any of the other brethren, and rewarded for their pains, is denied by the writer of the *Letter to Dr. FORMEY*; we leave the decision of the matter to those who have an opportunity of examining the fact.

547, l. 17. for pious, read, devout.

548, l. 17, for respective members of this community has, read, respectable members of this community have.

550, l. 6, for bent, read, beat.

551, l. 26, after England, add this note: The Socinians in England have never made any figure as a community, but have rather been dispersed among that great variety of sects, that have arisen in a country where liberty displays its most glorious fruits, and, at the same time, exhibits its most striking inconveniencies. Besides, few ecclesiastics or writers of any note have adopted the theological system, now under consideration, in all its branches. The Socinian doctrine, relating to the design and efficacy of the death of CHRIST, had indeed many abettors in England during the seventeenth century; and it may be presumed without temerity, that its votaries are rather increased than diminished in the present; but those divines, who have abandoned the *Athanasian hypothesis*, concerning the *Trinity of Persons in the God-head*, have more generally gone into the Arian and Semi-arian notions of that inexplicable subject, than into those of the Socinians,

nians, who deny that JESUS CHRIST existed before his appearance in the human nature. The famous JOHN BIDDLE, after having maintained both in public and in private, during the reign of CHARLES, and the protectorship of CROMWELL, the Unitarian system, erected an independent congregation in London, which is the only British church we have heard of, in which all the peculiar doctrines of Socinianism were inculcated; for if we may give credit to the account of Sir PETER PETT, this congregation held the following notions: "That the fathers, "under the Old Covenant, had only "temporal promises;—that saving "faith consisted in universal obedience "performed to the Commands of "GOD and CHRIST;—that CHRIST "rose again only by the power of the "Father, and not his own;—that "justifying faith is not the pure gift of "GOD, but may be acquired by men's "natural abilities;—that faith cannot "believe any thing contrary to, or "above reason;—that there is no ori- "ginal sin;—that CHRIST hath not "the same body now in glory, in "which he suffered and rose again;— "that the saints shall not have the "same body in heaven, which they "had on earth;—that CHRIST was "not Lord or King before his resur- "rection, or Priest before his ascen- "sion;—that the saints shall not, be- "fore the day of judgment, enjoy the "bliss of heaven;—that GOD doth not "certainly know future contingen- "cies;—that there is not any autho- "rity of fathers, or general councils, "in determining matters of faith;— "that CHRIST, before his death, had "not any dominion over the angels;— "and that CHRIST, by dying, made "not satisfaction for us." See the Preface to Sir PETER PETT's *Happy Future State of England*, printed at London, in 1688.

P. 552, after note [w], add: Dr. MOSHEIM places BIDDLE improperly among the Arians; it is manifest that he belongs to the Socinians, since, in the third arti-

cle of his confession of faith, he professeth to believe that CHRIST has no other than a human nature. See the Socinian Tracts, intituled, *The Faith of One God*, &c. published at London, in quarto, in 1691. See also the above note.

553, l. 33, for *berthren*, read, *brethren*.

555, l. 2, for *who*, read, *which*.

556, note, l. 24, for *in*, read, *into*.

557, l. 18, for *numerous*, read, *voluminous*; and, at the end of note [f], add: See also POIRET's *Epist. de Auctoribus Mysticis*, sect. xiv, p. 565. This treatise of POIRET is inserted at the end of his book *De Eruditione Solida & Superficiaria*, vol. ii, edit. quarto.

561, l. 19, after *ancestors*, add this note: TOURNON had been made, by the Pope, Patriarch of Antioch; and MEZZABARBA, to add a certain degree of weight to his mission, was created Patriarch of Alexandria. After his return, the latter was promoted to the Bishoprick of Lodi, a preferment which, tho' inferior in point of station to his imaginary Patriarchate, was yet more valuable in point of ease and profit. See a fuller account of this mission, in Dr. MOSHEIM's *Authentic Memoirs of the Christian Church in China*, p. 26, &c. N.

562, l. 28, after TYNDAL, read, and WOOLSTON, a man of an inauspicious genius, who made the most audacious, though senseless, attempts to invalidate the miracles of CHRIST. Add to these MORGAN, &c.

Ibid. note, l. 3, for *dispensation*, read, *dispensations*; and *del.* the whole note. [m].

566, l. 10, after *heretical*, add this note: To shew what a political weather-cock the infallibility of the holy father was upon this occasion, it may not be improper to place here an anecdote, which is related by VOLTAIRE, in his *Siècle de Louis XIV.*, vol. ii, under the article *Jansenisme*. The credit of the teller weighs but light in the balance of historical fame; the anecdote, however, is well attested, and is as follows: "The Abbé RENAUDOT, a learned "Frenchman, happening to be at Rome
" the

" the first year of the pontificate of
 " CLEMENT XI, went one day to see
 " the Pope, who was fond of men of
 " letters, and was himself a learned
 " man, and found his Holiness reading
 " Father QUENEL's book. On seeing
 " RENAUDOT enter the apartment, the
 " Pope said in a kind of rapture: *Here*
 " *is a most excellent book!—We have no-*
 " *body at Rome that is capable of writ-*
 " *ing in this manner;—I wish I could*
 " *engage the author to reside here! And*
 " *yet this same book was condemned*
 " *afterwards by this same Pope.*"

P. 567, l. 36, after *cause*, add this note:
 Things are greatly changed since the
 learned author wrote this paragraph.
 The storm of just resentment that has
 arisen against the Jesuits, and has been
 attended with the extinction of their
 order in *Portugal, France*, and in all
 the *Spanish* dominions, has disarmed
 the most formidable adversaries of Jan-
 senism, and must, consequently, be
 considered as an event highly favourable
 to the Jansenists.

571, at the end of note [s], add: As to the
 doctrines of this sect, they open a door
 to the most licentious effects of fanati-
 cism. Such, among many others, are
 the following, drawn from the express
 declarations of Count ZINZENDORF,
 the head and founder of the commu-
 nity: That the Law is not a rule of
 life to a believer;—that the Moral Law
 belongs only to the *Jews*;—that a con-
 verted person cannot sin against light.
 But of all the singularities for which
 this sect is famous, the notions they
 entertain of the organs of generation in
 both sexes, are the most enormously
 wild and extravagant. *I consider* (says
 Count ZINZENDORF, in one of his ser-
 mons) *the PARTS for distinguishing both*
sexes in Christians, as the most honourable
of the whole body, my Lord and God hav-
ing partly inhabited them, and partly worn
them himself. This raving sectary looks
 upon the conjugal act as a piece of
 scenery, in which the male represents
 CHRIST the husband of souls, and the
 female the church. *The married brother*
(says he) knows matrimony, respects it,

but does not think upon it of his own ac-
cord: and thus the precious member of the
covenant (i.e. the penis) is so much forgot,
becomes so useless, and consequently is re-
duced to such a natural numbness, by not
being used, that, afterwards, when he is
to marry, and use it, the Saviour must
restore him from this deadness of body.
And when an Esther, by grace, and sister,
according to her make, gets sight of this
member, her senses are shut up, and she
holily perceives, that God the Son was a
boy. Ye holy matrons, who, as wives, are
about your Vice-christs, honour that pre-
cious sign with the utmost veneration. We
 beg the chaste reader's pardon for pre-
 senting him with this odious specimen
 of the horrors of the Moravian theo-
 logy.

574, l. 2, 3, for from the communion of
 the *Romish* church, read, from each
 other.

Ibid. dele the whole note [z]; and, instead
 of it, add thus: [z] In the quarto edi-
 tion of this work, I mistook, in a mo-
 ment of inadvertency, the construction
 of this sentence in the original Latin,
 and rendered the passage as if Dr. MO-
 SHEIM had represented the Reformed
 Churches as diminishing the weight
 and importance of those controversies
 that separate them from the Church of
 Rome; whereas he represents them
 (and, indeed, what he says is rather an
 encomium than a reproach) as dimi-
 nishing the weight of those controver-
 sies which separate them from each other.
 One of the circumstances that made
 me fall more easily into this mistake,
 was my having read, the moment be-
 fore I committed it, Dr. MOSHEIM's
 insinuation with respect to the spirit of
 the Church of England in the very next
 page, where he says, very inconsider-
 ately, that we may judge of that spirit by
 the conduct of Dr. WAKE, who formed a
 project of peace and union between the
 English and Gallican Churches, founded
 upon this condition, that each of the two
 communities should retain the greatest part
 of their peculiar doctrines. This is sup-
 posing, though upon the foundation of
 a mistaken fact, that the Church of
 England,

England, at least, is making evident approaches to the church of Rome.—When I had made the mistake, which turned really an encomium into an accusation, I thought it incumbent upon me to defend the Reformed Church against the charge of an approximation to Popery. For this purpose I observed (in note [z] of the quarto edition) “that the Reformed Churches were never at such a distance from the spirit and doctrine of the Church of Rome, as they are at this day; and that the improvements in science that characterize the last and the present age, seem to render a relapse into *Remiss* superstition morally impossible in those, who have been once delivered from its baneful influence.” The ingenious author of the *Confessional* did not find this reasoning conclusive; and the objections he has started against it do not appear to me unsurmountable. I have therefore thrown upon paper some farther thoughts upon the present state of the Reformed Religion, and the influence of improvements in Philosophy upon its advancement; and these thoughts the reader will find in the Second Appendix.

P. 576, l. 6, *for* rules, *read*, rulers; and, l. 18, *after* zeal, *add this note*: The learned and pious Archbishop WAKE, in a letter to Father COURRAYER, dated from *Croydon-house*, July 9th, 1724, expresseth himself thus: “I bless GOD that I was born and have been bred in an episcopal church; which I am convinced has been the government established in the Christian Church from the very time of the apostles. But I should be unwilling to affirm, that *where* the ministry is not episcopal, there is no church, nor any true administration of the Sacraments. And very many there are among us, who are zealous for episcopacy, yet dare not go so far as to annul the ordinances of GOD performed by any other ministry.”

Ibid. l. 21, *for* afterwards, *read*, the present; and, l. 27, *for* at that time, *read*, now.

VOL. III.

Ibid. *dele* the whole note [c]; and, at the end of note [d], *add thus*: This note has been misunderstood and censured by the acute author of the *Confessional*. This censure gave occasion to the Third Appendix, which the reader will find immediately before these Corrections, and in which the matter contained in this note is fully illustrated, and the conduct of Archbishop WAKE set in its true light.

578, note, l. 13, *dele*, so much the more; and, l. 14, *dele* that.

579, l. 25, *after* Trinity, *add this note*: It is but too evident that few controversies have so little augmented the sum of knowledge, and so much hurt the spirit of charity, as the controversies that have been carried on, in the Christian Church, in relation to the doctrine of the Trinity. Mr. WHISTON was one of the first divines, who revived this controversy in the eighteenth century. About the year 1706 he began to entertain some doubts about the proper Eternity and Omniscience of CHRIST. This led him to review the popular doctrine of the Trinity; and, in order to execute this review with a degree of diligence and circumspection suitable to its importance, he read the New Testament twice over, and also all the ancient genuine monuments of the Christian Religion till near the conclusion of the second century. By this inquiry he was led to think, that, at the incarnation of CHRIST, the *Logos* or Eternal Wisdom supplied the place of the *rational soul* or *πνεῦμα*;—that the Eternity of the SON OF GOD was not a real *distinct* existence, as of a Son properly *co-eternal* with his Father by a true eternal generation, but rather a metaphysical existence *in potentia*, or in some sublimer manner, in the Father, as his Wisdom or Word;—that CHRIST’s real creation or generation (for both these terms are used by the earliest writers) took place some time before the creation of the world;—that the council of Nice, itself, established no other Eternity of CHRIST;—and, finally, that the Arian doctrine in these points was the

N

ADDITIONS, &c. TO MOSHEIM'S

the original doctrine of CHRIST himself, of his holy apostles, and of the most primitive Christians. Mr. WHISTON was confirmed in these sentiments by reading NOVATIAN'S treatise concerning the Trinity, but more especially by the perusal of the *apostolical constitutions*, the antiquity and authenticity of which he endeavoured, with more zeal than precision and prudence, to prove in the third part of his *Primitive Christianity revived*.

This learned, visionary, and upright man was a considerable sufferer by his opinions. He was not only removed from his theological and pastoral functions, but also from his mathematical professorship, as if Arianism had extended its baneful influence even to the science of lines, angles, and surfaces. This measure was undoubtedly singular, and it appeared rigid and severe to all those, of both parties, who were dispassionate enough to see things in their true point of light. And, indeed, though we should grant that the good man's mathematics might, by erroneous conclusions, have corrupted his orthodoxy, yet it will still remain extremely difficult to comprehend, how his heterodoxy could hurt his mathematics. It was not therefore consistent, either with clemency or good sense, to turn Mr. WHISTON out of his mathematical chair, because he did not believe the explication of the Trinity that is given in the Athanasian Creed; and I mention this as an instance of the unfair proceedings of immoderate zeal, which often confounds the plainest distinctions, and deals its punishments without measure or proportion.

Dr. SAMUEL CLARKE stepped also aside from the notions commonly received concerning the Trinity; but his modification of this doctrine was not so remote from the popular and orthodox hypothesis, as the sentiment of WHISTON. His method of inquiring into that incomprehensible subject was modest, and, at least, promised fair as a guide to truth. For he did not begin by abstract and metaphysical rea-

sonings in his illustrations of this doctrine, but turned his first researches to the *Word and to the Testimony*, persuaded that, as the doctrine of the Trinity was a matter of mere revelation, all human explications of it must be tried by the declarations of the New Testament, interpreted by the rules of grammar and the principles of sound criticism. It was this persuasion that produced the Doctor's famous book, intitled, *The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity, wherein every Text in the New Testament relating to that Doctrine is distinctly considered, and the Divinity of our Blessed Saviour according to the Scriptures proved and explained*. The doctrine, which this learned divine drew from his researches, was comprehended in fifty-five propositions, which, with the proper illustrations, form the second part of this work. The reader will find them there at full length. We shall only observe here, that Dr. CLARKE, if he was careful in searching after the true meaning of those Scripture-expressions that relate to the Divinity of the SON and the HOLY GHOST, was equally circumspect in avoiding the accusation of heterodoxy, as appears by the series of propositions now referred to. There are three great rocks of heresy on which many bold adventurers on this *Anti-pacific* ocean have been seen to split violently. These rocks are *Tritheism*, *Sabellianism*, and *Arianism*. Dr. CLARKE got evidently clear of the first, by denying the *Self-existence* of the SON and the HOLY GHOST, and, by maintaining their *derivation* from, and *subordination* to, the FATHER. He laboured hard to avoid the second, by acknowledging the personality and distinct agency of the SON and the HOLY GHOST. And he flattered himself with having escaped from the dangers of the third, by his asserting the *Eternity* (for the Doctor believed the possibility of an eternal production which WHISTON could not digest) of the two divine subordinate persons. But, with all his circumspection, Dr. CLARKE did not escape opposition and censure. He was abused and answered, and heresy was subdivided

subdivided and modified, in order to give him an opprobrious title, even that of *Semi-arian*. The convocation threatened, and the Doctor calmed, by his prudence, the apprehensions and fears, which his *Scripture-doctrine of the Trinity* had excited in that learned and reverend assembly. An authentic account of the proceedings of the two houses of convocation upon this occasion, and of Dr. CLARKE's conduct in consequence of the complaints that were made against his book, may be seen in a piece supposed to have been written by the Reverend Mr. JOHN LAWRENCE, and published at London, in octavo, in the year 1714, under the following title: *An Apology for Dr. CLARKE, containing an Account of the late Proceedings in Convocation upon his Writings concerning the Trinity*. The true copies of all the original papers, relating to this affair, are published in this apology.

If Dr. CLARKE was attacked by authority, he was also combated by argument. The learned Dr. WATERLAND was one of his principal adversaries, and stands at the head of a polemical body, composed of eminent divines, such as GASTREL, WELLS, NELSON, MAYO, KNIGHT, and others, who appeared in this controversy. Against these Dr. CLARKE, unawed by their numbers, defended himself with great spirit and perseverance in several *Letters* and *Replies*. This prolonged a controversy, which may often be suspended through the fatigue of the combatants, or the change of the mode in theological researches, but which will, probably, never be terminated; for nothing affords such an endless subject of debate, as a doctrine above the reach of human understanding, and expressed in the ambiguous and improper terms of human language, such as *persons*, *generation*, *substance*, &c. which in this controversy either convey no ideas at all, or false ones. The inconveniencies, accordingly, of departing from the divine simplicity of the scripture-language on this subject, and of making a matter of mere revelation an object of human

reasoning, were palpable in the writings of both the contending parties. For if Dr. CLARKE was accused of verging towards *Arianism* by maintaining the derived and *caused* existence of the SON and the HOLY GHOST, it seemed no less evident that Dr. WATERLAND was verging towards *Tritheism* by maintaining the *self-existence* and *independence* of these Divine Persons, and by asserting that, the subordination of the SON to the FATHER is only a subordination of OFFICE, and not of NATURE. So that if the former divine was deservedly called a *Semi-arian*, the latter might, with equal justice, be denominated a *Semi-tritheist*. The difference between these two learned men lay in this, that Dr. CLARKE, after making a faithful collection of the texts in Scripture, that relate to the Trinity, thought proper to interpret them by the maxims and rules of right reasoning that are used on other subjects; whereas Dr. WATERLAND denied that this method of reasoning was to be admitted in illustrating the doctrine of the Trinity, which was far exalted above the sphere of human reason, and therefore he took the texts of Scripture in their direct, literal, and grammatical sense. Dr. WATERLAND, however, employed the words *person*, *subsistence*, &c. as useful for fixing the notion of *distinction*; the words *uncreated*, *eternal*, and *immutable*, for ascertaining the Divinity of each *person*; and the words *interior*, *generation*, and *procession*, to indicate their *union*. This was departing from his grammatical method, which ought to have led him to this plain conclusion, that the SON and the HOLY GHOST, to whom divine attributes are ascribed in Scripture, and even the denomination of GOD to the former, possess these attributes in a manner which it is impossible for us to understand in this present state, and the understanding of which is consequently unessential to our salvation and happiness. The Doctor, indeed, apologizes in his *queries* (p. 321) for the use of these metaphysical terms, by observing, that "they are not de-

ADDITIONS, &c. TO MOSHEIM'S

“ signed to enlarge our views, or to
 “ add any thing to our stock of ideas,
 “ but to secure the plain fundamental
 “ truth, *that FATHER, SON, and HOLY*
 “ *GHOST, are all strictly divine and un-*
 “ *created, and yet are not Three Gods,*
 “ *but One God.*” It is, however, dif-
 ficult to comprehend how terms, that
 neither *enlarge our views* nor give us
 ideas, can secure any truth. It is dif-
 ficult to conceive what our faith gains
 by being entertained with a certain num-
 ber of *sounds*. If a *Chinese* should explain
 a term of his language, which I did
 not understand, by another term, which
 he knew before-hand that I understood as
 little, his conduct would be justly con-
 sidered as an insult against the rules of
 conversation and good breeding;—and
 I think it is an equal violation of the
 equitable principles of candid contro-
 versy, to offer, as illustrations, propo-
 sitions or terms that are as unintelligi-
 ble and obscure as the thing to be il-
 lustrated. The words of the excellent
 and learned STILLINGFLEET (in the
 preface to his *Vindication of the Doctrine*
of the Trinity) administer a plain and a
 wise rule, which, were it observed by
 divines, would greatly contribute to
 heal the wounds which both *truth* and
charity have received in this controversy.
 “ Since both sides yield (says he) that
 “ the matter they dispute about is
 “ above their reach, the wisest course

“ they can take, is, to assert and de-
 “ fend *what is revealed*, and not to be
 “ *peremptory* and quarrelsome about that
 “ which is acknowledged to be above
 “ our comprehension, I mean, as to
 “ the manner, how the *Three Persons*
 “ partake of the *Divine Nature*.”

Those, who are desirous of a more
 minute historical view of the manner in
 which the Trinitarian controversy has
 been carried on during this present cen-
 tury, may consult a pamphlet, inti-
 tuled, *An Account of all the Considerable*
Books and Pamphlets, that have been wrote
on either Side, in the Controversy concern-
ing the Trinity, since the Year 1712; in
which is also contained, an Account of the
Pamphlets written, this last Year, on each
Side, by the Dissenters, to the End of the
Year 1719. This pamphlet was pub-
 lished at London, in the year 1720.
 The more recent treatises on the subject
 of the Trinity are sufficiently known.

Ibid. l. 33, after subordination, add this
 note: It will appear to those, who read
 the preceding note [g], that Dr. MO-
 SHEIM has here mistaken the true hy-
 pothesis of Dr. CLARKE, or, at least,
 expressed it imperfectly; for what he
 says here is rather applicable to the opi-
 nion of Dr. WATERLAND. Dr. CLARKE
 maintained an equality of perfections
 between the Three Persons, but a *sub-*
ordination of nature in point of existence
 and derivation.

CORREC-

CORRECTIONS in the CHRONOLOGICAL TABLES.

VOL. II.

- PAGE 592, under Remarkable Events, after the 7th line, add: Pope AGATHO ceases to pay the tribute which the see of Rome was accustomed to pay the Emperor at the election of its pontif.
- 599, Cent. XI, col. 2, l. 11, for BENEDICT VII, read, BENEDICT VIII.
- 611, under Remarkable Events, read the 9th paragraph thus: The art of printing with moveable wooden types is invented by COSTER at Harlem; and the farther improvements of this admirable art are owing to GENSFLEICH and GUTTEMBERG of Mentz, and SCHOEFFER of Strasburg.
- Ibid.* read the 11th paragraph thus: The first book printed with types of metal; which was the *Vulgate Bible*, published at Mentz, in 1450; a second edition of the same book was published at Mentz in 1462, and has been mistaken for the first.
- 613, at the head of the British authors, place Sir THOMAS MORE.
- 616, Cent. XVII, under EDWARD POCK, in the list of Protestant writers, add: Dr. GOODWIN, Dr. MANTON, RICHARD BAXTER, Dr. CALAMY, HOWE, BATES.
- 617, col. 4, l. 42, for MESTER ZAT, read, MESTERZAT.
- 624, col. 4, after Bishop CONYBEAR, add, Bishop BENSON, Dr. BENSON, Dr. PIERCE, HALLET, Dr. FOSTER, GROVE, Dr. WATTS, Dr. DODDRIDGE, Dr. TAYLOR of Norwich, Bishop SQUIRE, Dr. SAMUEL CHANDLER, Dr. JOHN LELAND; and, in the same column, dele, BEAUSOBRE, LENFANT, BOUILLER.
- Ibid.* col. 7, after l. 43, add, Dr. JOHN TAYLOR; and after l. 51, add, Bishop SQUIRE.
- 625, col. 4, after MARTIN, l. 6, add, JAMES SAURIN, DE LA CHAPELLE, MAURICE, PICTET, BEAUSOBRE, LENFANT, BOUILLER.
- 626, col. 7, l. 17, for DE STOUCHES, read, DESTOUCHES; and, after l. 53, add, VILLARET, CLAIRAUT, CAYLUS, CREVIER.
- 628, add, at the end of the last column, TIE. HEMSTERHUIS, VAN LOON the historian.

CORREC-

CORRECTIONS of the INDEX.

INDEX.

- A**
- PAGE 629, first column, article Abelard, after 599, add, 601; and, l. 3, before 603, add, 587.
- Ibid.* art. Acominatus, before 689, add, 679.
- Ibid.* art. Adalbert, l. 2, for 367, read, 376.
- Ibid.* 2d col. art. Agapetus, after 293, add 298.
- Ibid.* art. Albert, after 637, add, his character, 680, and [g].
- Ibid.* art. Alcuin, before 362, add, 346; and, after 364, add, homilies, 365.
- 630, 1st col. art. Alexander VII, after his, read, bad.
- Ibid.* l. 8, for patriarch, read, patriarch.
- Ibid.* art. Alphonsus, after X, add, King of Leon and Castile.
- Ibid.* art. Amalric, l. 2, after who, read, *ibid.* and dele and.
- Ibid.* 2d col. art. Amiraute, l. 3, for ii, 487, his, read, 486, and.
- Ibid.* art. Anabaptists, l. 2, after [o], add, 164.
- 631, 1st col, art. Anselm, after Cartes, in l. 3, add, *ibid.* and after character, dele *ibid.*
- Ibid.* art. Ansgar, add, or, Anschaire.
- Ibid.* 2d col. art. Apollinarian, l. 2, before fate, add, and again, 263.
- Ibid.* art. for Apostolians, read, Apostolians.
- Ibid.* art. Aquinas, l. 4, after 685, add, 686.
- 632, 1st col. art. Aristotelian, l. 3, after *ib.* add, its state in xvi cent. ii, 324.
- Ibid.* art. Aristotle, l. 3, after 239, add, and in xiii cent. 635, 636; l. 4, after Paris, add, 635 and [u].
- B**
- 633, 2d col. art. Bacon, Roger, l. 2, for [p], read, [q]; and, after 635, add, 681 and [k]; l. 3, dele Bacon, Roger, and read called, dele his; l. 4, dele character, dele and, read his, dele 638, read *ibid.*
- Ibid.* art. Bacon, Lord Verulam, l. 2, add, 332.
- 634, 1st col. art. 1st Barsumas, add, of Nisibis.
- Ibid.* art. Becker, add, ii, 331.
- Ibid.* 2d col. art. Beghards, l. 2, after i, add, 742, 743; l. 3, after 757, add, 758.
- Ibid.* art. Behmen, after ii, add, 325, 437.
- 635, 1st col. art. Bernard, St. add, writes against the vices of the clergy, i, 572.
- Ibid.* art. Bessarion, add, Cardinal; and, l. 5, dele, Bessarion, Cardinal.
- Ibid.* art. Blandrata, at end, add, v. David, Francis.
- Ibid.* 2d col. art. Bockhold, l. 2, after 240, add, and [p]; l. 3, after *ib.* add, and [r], v. Anabaptists.
- Ibid.* art. Bonaventure, after I, add, attempts to reconcile the two factions of the Franciscans, 663.
- Ibid.* art. Boniface, Winifred, add, Archbishop of Mentz, and Primate of Germany and Belgium; at end, add, instrumental in the condemnation of Adalbert, and Clement of Ireland, 376.
- 636, 1st col. art. Bossuet, add, Bishop of Meaux, his conference with Claude, ii, 349, l. 2, dele ii. at end, add, his method of controversy, 354, 355 [k].
- Ibid.* art. Boulainvilliers, after and, add, his.
- Ibid.* art. Bradwardine, l. 2, after 718, add, 747.
- Ibid.* art. Brethren and Sisters, &c. at end, add, persecuted and burnt in xiv cent. 755, but not extirpated, 756, v. Beghards.
- Ibid.* 2d col. art. Bruno, after i, add, 466 [h], and.
- Ibid.* art. Budnæans, after Franken, add, and others.
- Ibid.* art. Burchard, add, Bishop of Wormes; at end, add, assisted in them by Olbert, *ibid.*

C

P. 636, 2d col. art. Cajetan, after Cardinal, add, his conference with Luther, ii, 20; l. 2, dele ii.

Ibid. art. Calixtus, after ii, add, 352, 353 [d], 434; l. 2, after design, add, 445; at end, add, v. Syncretistical.

Ibid. art. Calvin, after John, add, account of ii, 48, 49 [a] [b]; l. 2, dele ii; at end, add, his opinions gain ground, 482.

637, 1st col. art. Camerarius, add, Joachim; l. 2, dele Camerarius, Joachim.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Cappel, for contests, through reconciling concessions, read, contests concerning the Hebrew points; l. 3, dele [s]; at end, add, by whom supported, ibid. [s].

Ibid. art. Cardan, for [m], read [n].

Ibid. art. Cardinals, dele by William granted; l. 3, for 491, read, 492, and add, 494, 582; l. 4, for 492, read, 491.

Ibid. art. Carlostadt, add, disputation between him and Eckius, ii, 23, 24 [c]; l. 2, dele ii, and, after 32, add, 164; l. 4, after 34, add, 165 and [g] [h] [i].

Ibid. art. Cartes, after ii, add, 321; l. 2, after philosophy, add, 317 and [s]; and, after 327, add, 437.

638, 2d col. art. Charlemagne, l. 1, for 342, read, 341; l. 7, after success, add, ibid. and.

639, 1st col. art. Cetularius, after Michael, add, Patriarch of C. P. at end, add, and excommunicates him, ibid.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Christ, after about, l. ult. add, his presence in the Eucharist, 413, and.

641, 1st col. art. Christians, l. 10 from bottom, before by, add, in x cent.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Christiern II, l. 2 from top, dele how he, and read Christiern III; l. 4, for and confined, read, which was confirmed.

Ibid. art. Chrysostom, at end, add, deposed by the council of Chalcedon, 256, banished to Cusucus and dies, 257, and [w] [x]; after works, add, i.

Ibid. art. Church, Greek, l. 5, for Urban III, read, Urban VIII.

642, 1st col. art. Church, reformed, add, its decline, ii, 474; cruel and oppres-

sive behaviour of the French court and bishops, in xvii cent. 475; l. 2, dele in xvii cent.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Church, Romish, l. 7, after removed, add, and by what means, ibid. dele with.

643, 1st col. art. Cistercian, at end, add, called from him Bernardin monks, ib.

Ibid. art. Clement, of Ireland, after [k], add, and [l].

Ibid. art. Clement V, l. 2, after i, add, 722.

Ibid. art. Clement VI, l. 2, after 727, add, purchases Avignon, ibid.

Ibid. art. Clement VIII, for Caldobrandini, read, Aldobrandini.

Ibid. art. Clement IX, l. 2, before Pope, read, Clement X.

Ibid. art. Clement XI, after 338, add, and [m], 563.

Ibid. art. Collegiants disputes, &c. dele the whole.

Ibid. art. Collegiants, dele Rhinsbergers; l. 2, after [u], begin a new article, and read thus: Collegiants Rhinsbergers, a religious sect in Holland, their founder, and why so called, ii, 553; comprehensive community, 554; how united, ibid. disputes among, and their opponents, ibid. and [x].

644, 1st col. art. Comestor, for 592, read, 593.

Ibid. art. Conception, l. 3, after 608, add, indulgences to those who observed its festival, in xv cent. 802.

Ibid. art. Concord, l. 2, after of, add, 181 and [b]; l. 3, after [c], add, [d]; l. 6, after 183, add, 184; after motives, add, ibid. and [h]; l. 7, dele with, and after conduct, add, who at first was zealous for it, 184; ult. after ib. add, why composed, 195.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Constantine, at end, add, his pretended donation to the see of Rome examined, 357 [a].

Ibid. art. Constantinople, l. 7, for 301, read, 300; l. 8, for ib. read, 301; at end, add, Council in vii cent. called Quini-sextum, enact laws concerning rites and ceremonies, 328 and [y], 336 and [u].

645, 2 col. art. Copts, add, who, their.

INDEX.

P. 645, 2d col. art. Corbinian, for preachers, read, preaches.

Ibid. art. Crusades, at end, add, other expeditions, their success, and misfortunes, 624—626; fruitless attempts to renew them in xiv cent. 711.

D

646, 1st col. art. Damascenus, at end, add, 529.

Ibid. art. Damianus, for morality, unsuccessful against the Jews, read, character of, and works; after 524, add, moral writer, 530; unsuccessful against the Jews, *ibid.*

Ibid. 2d col. art. Dionysius, little, after 294, add, 298.

E

647, 2d col. art. Eginard, for 587, read, 387.

648, 1st col. art. Eligius, add, or; l. 2, after i, add, 319.

Ibid. art. Elipand, at end, add, condemned, 376.

Ibid. art. Ennodius, l. 2, for 209, read, 289.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Ernest, Justinian, after the, add, Gospel.

Ibid. art. Eustathius, Thessalonica, at end, add, 591.

649, 1st col. art. Eutychian, l. 1, for 366, read, 306.

F

Ibid. art. Ficinius, l. 2, for a, read, the.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Firmin, after cent. add, and where.

Ibid. art. Frumentius, at end, add, ii, 358 [e].

G

Ibid. art. Gassendi, after ii, add, 321; l. 3, after [b], add, 437; l. 5, dele *ib.* at end, add, why unsuccessful in France, 380.

650, 1st col. art. Germans, l. 2, after [f], add, 230.

Ibid. art. Gerson, after works, add, and great character.

Ibid. art. Ghost, l. 3, for [b], read, [b][c].

Ibid. art. Godeschalc, l. 6, after opponents, add, *ibid.* l. 10, for and [r], read, origin of the dispute between him and Rabanus Maurus, *ibid.* and [r].

Ibid. 2d col. art. Gratian, after laws, add, or decretals; l. 2, after 568, add, 592.

Ibid. art. Gregory, Great, for 296, read, 293, 296, 297.

H

Ibid. art. Harold, add, King.

651, 1st col. art. Heraclian, for 304, read, 305.

Ibid. art. Heric, at end, add, 400.

Ibid. art. Hesychius, after i, add, 323.

Ibid. art. Hetzer, after ii, add, 237.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Hildebrand, l. 2, for 466, read, 496, for 597, read, 497.

Ibid. art. Hilduin, at end, add, character of that work, 409.

Ibid. art. Hincmar, after i, add, 387, at end, add, his cruelty to Goteschalcus, 416, 417.

Ibid. art. Hoe, at end, add, supposed to irritate the Elector of Saxony against the Elector Palatine, 441 [s].

Ibid. art. Hoffman, l. 2, after and, add, his; at end, add, his fanaticism, 437.

Ibid. art. Honorius, at end, add, condemned in a general council, 334.

J I

652, 2d col. art. Jansenism, at end, add, v. Church Romish.

653, 1st col. art. Jesuits, l. 5, for xiv, read xvi, at end, add, why protected by the Popes, 384.

654, 1st col. art. Indulgences, at end, add, sold openly, 723.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Investitures, l. 14, for ii, read, xii.

Ibid. art. Joachim, after Abbot, add, of Flora; l. 2, after i, add, 600; and, after [s], add, 680 and [c]; l. 5, dele tot.

655, 1st col. art. John XV, l. 2, after i, add, 403.

Ibid. art. John XXII, after his, add, bad, dele i, 724; l. 4, after [p], add, 740.

Ibid. art. Jonas, at end, add, writes in defence of images, 412.

Ibid. 1st col. art. Jubilee, for 752, read, 753.

K

Ibid. 2d col. art. Kilian, for 321, read, 311.

L

Ibid. art. Lanfranc, after 483, add, 524.

656, 1st col. art. Leo Philosopher, add, VI, Emperor; at end, add, deposed for his fourth marriage, 460.

P. 656,

P. 656, 2d col. art. Leo X, at end, add, supposed infidel, 78.

657, 1st col. art. Lithuanians, after converted, add, by force of arms.

Ibid. art. Lollards, after 744, add, and [u].

M

658, 1st col. art. Macarius, l. 2, after 196, begin a fresh article for what follows, and read, Macarius, an Irishman, ix cent, &c.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Major, for Gregory, read, George.

659, 1st col. art. Marpurg, l. 2, after 41, add, 191; at end, after ib. add, [y].

Ibid. art. Mary, l. 2, after in, add, xii cent. i, 606, and in.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Melancthon, l. 3, after ib. add, famous for his knowledge of history, 154; l. 4, after ib. add, and 80; l. 6, for 176, read, 169, 170; l. 7, for [p], read, [q]; l. 10, after Lutherans, add, 179.

660, 1st col. art. Methodius, add, Bishop of Tyre; l. 3, after 143, add, his discourse on free-will and chastity, ibid.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Molinos, l. 2, for 107, read, 407.

661, 1st col. art. Moors, for 354, read, 345.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Munzer, l. 2, after 36, add, 163, 236; l. 3, after Luther, add, 36, 164; l. 4, for ib. read, 36, 237.

N

Ibid. art. Nantes, at end, add, perfidiously revoked, 476.

662, 1st col. art. Newton, after ii, add, 321.

Ibid. art. Nogent, at end, add, commentaries, 603.

O

Ibid. 2d col. art. Occam, after 719, add, 747, 748; l. 2, dele 747, 748.

Ibid. art. Ochinus, at end, add, 263, 264 [m].

P

663, 2d col. art. Pachymeres, after i, add, 631.

Ibid. art. Palæologus, after Jacob, add, a Budnean Socinian.

Ibid. art. Palamus, read, Palamas; after Gregory, add i. 747.

664, 1st col. art. Papin, l. 2, for who, VOL. III.

read, and; at end, add, abjures the Protestant religion, ibid.

Ibid. art. Paracelsists, after ii, add, 156 and [s].

Ibid. art. Paracelsus, add, a supposed infidel, ii, 78.

Ibid. art. Passau, at end, add, 152 and [k].

Ibid. art. Patrick, at end, read, i, 232 and [r].

Ibid. art. Paul, deacon, add, homilies, 365.

Ibid. art. Paul II, add, reduces the Jubilee circle to every twenty-five years, ibid.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Paul V, l. 2, at end, add, 361 and [z].

665, 2d col. art. Photius, l. 8, after degraded, add, ibid. dele and; l. 9, after brought, add, by him, l. 10, for [y], read, [y] [z].

666, 1st col. art. Pletho, at end, add, 791.

667, 1st col. art. Poree, after i, add, 592.

Ibid. art. Prætorius, after ii, add, 350 and [r].

Ibid. 2d col. art. Prester John, l. 2, after [n], add, invades Tartary, ibid. then begin a new article, — a successor of the same name, loses, &c. l. 3, for 593, read, i, 556; l. 4, after effects, add, of this, and for ib. read, 563.

Ibid. art. Prophets, l. 2, after some, add, pretended visionaries.

R

668, 1st col. art. Prussians, after converted, add, by force of arms; dele, i. 627.

Ibid. art. Puritans, after cent. add, ii; l. 8, dele ii; at end, add, their violence, 496.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Rabanus, after Maurus, add, Archbishop of Mentz; l. 2, for 299, read, 399.

Ibid. art. Radbert, l. 4, after i, add, 400, and after 414, add, his Scripture allegories, 407.

Ibid. art. Ratisbon, at end, add, another conference in xvii cent. between Papists and Protestants, 348.

Ibid. art. Realists, after [b], add, rise of them in x cent. 444.

669, 2d col. art. Remigius, at end, add, explains the ritual, 423, 459.

Ibid. art. Richer, at end, for 110, read, 111.

671, 2d col. art. Roscelinus, add, the famous Nominalist, i, 485.

O

S

P. 672, 1st col. art. Saints lives, at end, add, 403.

Ibid. art. Saints, after in, add, ix cent. 402.

Ibid. art. Sanction, at end, add, abrogated, ii, 7 and [g].

Ibid. art. Saracens, l. 6, after 343, add, are subdued by the Turks, ibid.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Schism, after Western, add, begun in xiv cent. i, 728; account of, ibid. and seq.

673, 1st and 2d col. art. Scotus, Johannes, dele Scotus Johannes, three times, and at end, add, opposes Goteschalculus, 414; Radbert, 415, explains the ritual, 423.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Scotus, John-Duns, after i, read, 718.

674, 1st col. art. Serapion, dele successful, at end, add, unfortunate issue, ibid.

Ibid. art. Sfondrati, after Cœlestine, add, Cardinal.

Ibid. 2d. col. art. Silvester II, at end, add, his great character, 445; his Works, 454.

Ibid. art. Socinians, at end, add, v. Blandrata, Budnœans, Farnovians, Lubieniecious.

675, 1st col. art. Socinus, Faustus, l. 5, for Cracow, read, Racow.

Ibid. art. Sorbonne, l. 2, after character, add, and College.

Ibid. art. Spinoza, at end, dele ib. and add, called Pantheists, and why, ibid.

Ibid. art. Stephen, add, son of Geyfa, a chief, and at end, add, fainted, 435.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Strabo, after i, add, 387; after 400, add, 406; writes in defence of images, 412; explains the ritual, 423.

T

676, 1st col. art. Taion, at end, add, the first systematical divine, 529.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Theodore of Tarsus, l. 4, dele Theodore of Tarsus.

677, 1st col. art. Theodorus Abucara, after [o], add, writes against the Saracens, 409.

Ibid. 2d col. art. (2d) Theophylact, add, the Bulgarian, i, 524.

Ibid. art. Theffalonica, at end, add, his book concerning rites and ceremonies, 801.

678, 1st col. art. Tostatus, l. 2, for 798, read, 797.

V

679, 1st col. art. Vicelinus, at end, add, his excellent character, ibid.

Ibid. art. Victor, Richard, add, refutes the scholastics, 600.

Ibid. art. Vigilius, l. 2, after 302, add, and [x].

Ibid. art. Voëtians, at end, add, character of their founder, ibid.

W

Ibid. 2d col. art. Waldenses, dele this word, eight times, and run them all into one article.

Ibid. art. Waterlandians, l. 2, after ii, add, 233 [f], 245 and [y].

680, 1st col. art. Wickliff, John, dele these two words twice, and run the three into one article; and, in l. 3, after 731, add, translates the Scriptures into English, ibid. l. 5, after 732, add, 777; dies peaceably, 732; l. 6, after dug, add, up; l. ult. after 733, add, 778.

Ibid. art. Wlodomir, l. 3, dele this word; at end, add, denied this honour by the Latins, ibid.

Z

681, 1st col. art. Zeno, for x, read, v.

Ibid. art. Zigabenus, after 591, add, 596; l. 2, dele his; l. 3, for 604, read, of his works, ibid. defends the Greek Church, 604.

Ibid. 2d col. art. Zonaras, at end, add, satire upon some Polemical writers, 603.

ADDITIONS to the INDEX.

- A**
- ABO*, a monkish historian, x cent. i, 444.
- Abſalom*, Archbishop of London, his extraordinary character, i, 551 and [b].
- Abul-Farai*, Gregory, Primate of the Jacobites, his great character, i, 631 and [a] 685.
- Acropolita*, a Greek historian, xiii cent. i, 631.
- Acacius*, Biſhop of Conſtantinople, his conteſt with Pope Felix II, i, 272 and (s).
- Adalbert*, of Prague, his endeavours in x cent. to convert the Pruſſians, i, 466; his fate, *ibid*.
- , or *Albert*, the firſt biſhop in Pomerania, in xii cent. i, 551.
- Adiaphoriſtic* controverſy, hiſtory of, v. *Controverſy*.
- Ado* and *Anaſtaſius*, hiſtorians in ix cent. i, 387, 401.
- Adrian* I, Pope, in viii cent. confers upon the Emperor the right of election to the ſee of Rome, i, 359 and [k]; enters into an alliance with the Empreſs Irene, 372.
- Æmiliani*, Jerom, Founder of the Clarkeſ of the Order of St. Maieul, or the Fathers of Somasquo, ii, 103.
- Agobard*, his character and works, i, 387, 399, 423; writes againſt the Jews, 409.
- Albigenſes*, applied to all heretics, i, 545 [q].
- Alexander* III, Pope, deprives the Biſhops, &c. of the power of canonization, i, 459, 583; cauſes ſchools to be erected in cathedrals and monaſteries, 566; depoſes the Emperor Frederic Barbaroſſa, 578; makes peace with him, 579; his diſpute with Henry II, of England, *ibid*. confers the title of king upon the Duke of Portugal, 583 and [y]; confines the election of a Pope to the Cardinals alone, 582.
- VI, Pope, divides America between the Portugeze and Spaniards, i, 762.
- Alexandria*, Patriarch of, his juriſdiction, ii, 126, 127 [o].
- Ambroſe*, of Camalduli, his works, i, 792.
- Amiraut*, his doctrines oppoſed, ii, 487; by whom ſupported, *ibid*.
- Amulo*, writes againſt the Jews, ix cent. i, 409.
- Allatius*, Leo, his attempt to unite the Greek
- Alphonſus* VI, King of Naples, patron of learning, i, 764.
- and Latin Churches, ii, 416 and [f].
- Altenberg*, conference there, to heal the Lutheran diviſions, ii, 178.
- Ames*, William, ſeconds Maccovius in applying ſcholastic ſubtleties in theology, ii, 226 [n].
- Anabaptiſts*, Engliſh, account of, ii, 503 [x].
- Anaſtaſius*, the Emperor, favours the Acephali, i, 306.
- Andreæ*, James, employed to reconcile the Lutheran divines, ii, 179, v. *Form of Concord*.
- Andræas*, Antonius, i, 747.
- Anchialus*, Michael, Patriarch of C. P. his character, i, 564.
- Andronicus*, Emperor of C. P. forbids ſpeculative diſputes, i, 605.
- Anſelm*, (*after Cartes add*) oppoſed for it by Gaunilo, a French monk, *ibid*. and [p]; the firſt who publiſhed a general ſyſtem of theology, 529.
- Antioch*, Patriarch of, his juriſdiction, ii, 127; four biſhops claim that title, *ibid*. [p].
- Antoninus*, of Florence, i, 792.
- Arabian* philoſophers, ſeveral of their books tranſlated into Latin, in xii cent. i, 571 and [u].
- Armagh*, Richard of, oppoſes the Mendicants, i, 730.
- Arnauld*, his diſpute with the Jeſuits, ii, 119; diſtinction in favour of Janſenius, 398.
- Arndt*, John, a moral writer, ii, 446; a Paraceliſt, 157.
- Arnold*, of Breſcia, account of him and his ſect, in xii cent. i, 614.
- Arvernus*, William, i, 684.

INDEX.

ADDITIONS, &c. TO MOSHEIM'S

Afinus, John Pungens, in xiii cent. substitutes *con* for *transubstantiation*, i, 691.
Ave-Maria, when added to the prayers, i, 757.
Avignon, added to the patrimony of St. Peter, i, 727.
Aureolus, Peter, his works, i, 747.
Authbert, converts the Swedes, ix cent. i, 378.
Autun, Honorius, his character and works, i, 592; Polemic writer, 603.
Auxerre, William of, his theological system, i, 592.

B

Balbi, John, i, 634.
Balduin, his tenets, in xviii cent. ii, 466.
Barbarossa, Frederic, Emperor of Germany, his unfortunate expedition into Palestine, xii cent. i, 558; refuses to hold the Pope's stirrup, 578; forbids transferring of fiefs without the Lord's consent, *ibid*.
Barrow, Isaac, his zeal for natural knowledge, ii, 332.
Bayle, sceptical philosopher, ii, 334.
Becket, Thomas, Archbishop of Canterbury, refuses to obey the constitutions of Clarendon, i, 579; murdered, 581 and 582 [t]; fainted, 582.
Benedict, of Nursia, founder of the order, i, 292; his works, 294.
 — IX, Pope, his character, i, 723.
 — XIII, Anti-pope, i, 769; deposed, 770.
 — XIII, his character, ii, 563.
 — XIV, his character, ii, 564.
Bello-Visu, Armand de, i, 681.
Bembo, Peter, Cardinal, supposed infidel writer, ii, 78.
Beccus, or *Veccus*, John, account of, i, 679, 691.
Bernard, Saint, Abbot of Clairval, preaches up the crusade, i, 556; draws up a rule of discipline for the Knights Templars, 560; Cistercians called from him Bernardine monks, 585; his amazing influence, *ibid*. opposes the notion of the immaculate conception, 606.
Bernardine, of Sens, i, 799.
Bernoulli, the two, philosophers, ii, 321.
Berulle, Cardinal, v. *Jesus*.
Bertharius, i, 387, 401, 406.
Bertram, confutes Macarius, i, 388; controversy with Radbert concerning

the presence of Christ in the Eucharist, 414, and concerning the manner of his birth, 419; defends Godeschalcus, 416; disputes with Hincmar about the hymn *Trina Deitas*, 418; defends the Latin Church against Photius, 421.
Bibliasts, their disputes with the scholastic divines, i, 687.
Biddle, a Socinian writer in xvii cent. ii, 552.
Biel, i, 792.
Boleslaus, King of Poland, revenges the murder of Adalbert, i, 466; compels the Prussians to receive Christianity, *ib*.
Boniface, attempts to convert the Prussians, his fate, i, 466.
 — VIII, Pope, adds the sixth book of the decretals, i, 639; his infamous character, 651; institutes the Jubilee, 652; quarrels with Philip the Fair, i, 721; excommunicates him, *ibid*.
Bodin, supposed infidel writer, xvi cent. ii, 78.
Bossuet, his defence of the Regale, ii, 366 [k].
Boyle, Robert, his lectures, ii, 310 and [y], 321, 332.
Bolonia, fame of that academy in xii cent. i, 565; spurious diploma of its antiquity, 566 [e].
Blastares, Matthew, his works, i, 746.
Blank, Lewis Le, Protestant peace-maker, ii, 351.
Brahe, Tycho, philosopher, ii, 321.
Brulifer, i, 792.
Bruno, founder of the Carthusians, i, 520; account of, *ibid*. and [h].
 —, attempts, with Boniface, to convert the Prussians, his fate, i, 466.
 —, Jordano, a supposed infidel, ii, 78.
Bruys, Peter de, founder of the Petrobrussians, i, 612, v. *Petrobrussians*.
Bryennius, Nicephorus, an historian, i, 564.
Bugorrahagus, John, his expositions, ii, 159.
Burckhard, Francis, writes against the treaty of Passau, ii, 152.
Burg, Gibbon de, his pacificatory attempts, ii, 350.
Bus, Cæsar de, founder of the fathers of the Christian doctrine, ii, 103.
Burley, Walter, his character, i, 718, 747.
Buscher, Statius, his character, ii, 448; his Crypto-papismus, *ibid*.

Caba-

C

Cabasilas, Nicholas, his character, i, 716.

——, Nilus, his character, i, 747.

Calixtus II, Pope, his good character, i, 575; peace between him and the Emperor Henry, 576.

—— III, Pope, institutes in xv cent. the festival of the transfiguration, i, 802.

——, expositions of Scripture, ii, 444; separates faith from morality, 446.

Calovius, his comments on Scripture, ii, 453.

Calvin, his method of interpreting the Scripture, ii, 479.

Cambalu, the present Peking in China, erected into an Archbishoprick in xiv cent. i, 712.

Cameron, John, his reconciling doctrine, ii, 486.

Cantipratenfis, Thomas, i, 681.

Capistran, John, his works and character, i, 792.

Capreolus, John, i, *ibid.*

Carico, eminent for his knowledge in history, ii, 154.

Castilians, their extraordinary method to end the dispute between the Gothic and Roman service in xi cent. i, 542.

Cedrenus, an historian xi cent. i, 478.

Celestine III, Pope, excommunicates the Emperor, the Duke of Austria, and the King of Galicia and Leon, i, 584.

—— V, Pope, his good character, i, 651; resigns, fainted, founder of the Celestines, *ibid.* 669 and [s], 670.

Cellite, Brethren, or Alexians, or Lollards, account of, i, 744.

Cerinthus, his tenets, i, 69.

Chamfi, or Solares, account of, ii, 143.

Charlemagne, his character, i, 342; views in enriching the clergy, 350 [n]; his Homiliarium, 365 and [g] [b]; orders the Lives of the Saints to be written, 366; his four books against image-worship and the second Nicene council, 372 and [y].

Charles II, of England, a patron of arts, ii, 321.

Charenton, synod, pacificatory attempts, ii, 431.

Charron, an enemy to the Gospel, ii, 78.

Chemnitius, examination of the council of Trent, ii, 154.

Chosroas, King of Persia in vi cent. a bitter enemy to Christianity, i, 284; favours the philosophy of Aristotle, 287.

Christ, dispute in xvii cent. concerning the omnipresence of his Flesh, ii, 463.

——, controversy revived in xv cent. concerning the kind of worship due to his Blood, i, 800; how decided by Pope Pius II, 801.

Childeric III, King of France, deposed by Pope Zachary, viii cent. i, 352 and [q].

Chinese Christians, dispute concerning allowing them their old religious rites, ii, 560.

Christina, Queen of Sweden, her change of religion and character, ii, 355 and [m].

Chrysoloras, Manuel, character of, i, 716, 717.

Church, Greek, history of, and low state, in xvi cent. ii, 126; doctrine of, 128; unsuccessful attempt to unite it with the Protestants, 129; those members of it, who have been educated in the Romish Church, their remarkable aversion to Popery, 141 and [s].

——, Reformed, history of, ii, 187 & seq. not united, 188; how far this remark is true, *ibid.* [q]; dispute between it and the Lutheran Church concerning the Eucharist, 191; progress of it, *ib.* state in the Netherlands, 213; in Poland, 214; divisions, 217 and [q]; doctrine of, 218; difference between it and the Lutherans, *ibid.* upon what points, 219; form of ecclesiastical government, 221 and [z].

——, Lutheran, accession to it, and state in xviii cent. 568; intestine enemies, 569; divisions, 572.

Chytraeus, famous for his knowledge of history, ii, 154.

Cinnamus, an historian, i, 564.

Clement VIII, Anti-pope, i, 772.

—— XI, Pope, his Bull Unigenitus, ii, 564; its effect, *ibid.*

Clarendon, constitutions of, i, 580 [s].

Clarke, Samuel, a divine in xviii cent. ii, 599.

Clarius, Isidore, comment on St. Paul's Epistles, ii, 110.

Claudius, Bishop of Turin, his expositions and chronology, i, 399, 406; his zeal

ADDITIONS, &c. TO MOSHEIM'S

- zeal against image-worship, and success, 412.
- Claudius*, account of his heresy, ii, 259.
- Cocceius*, his method of interpreting Scripture, ii, 479; his notions and character, 510; a sect named Cocceians in xvii cent. 509.
- Codinus*, George, his works, i, 791.
- Cogitosus*, an Irishman, a writer of the Lives of the Saints, i, 298.
- Colonna*, Dominic, his history of the controversies in the Romish Church, ii, 120 [e].
- Comnenus*, Alexis, Emperor of Greece, his suspicions of the first crusade, i, 470; a patron of letters, 478; his controversy with the Manichæans, 544.
- , Emanuel, Emperor of Greece, character, and writings, i, 604, 605.
- Conception*, Immaculate, controversy in xvii cent. ii, 406.
- Concordate*, established in France, when and by whom, ii, 7; account of it, ib. [b].
- Conference*, between Protestants and Papists at Ratisbon, ii, 348; at Newbury, ibid. at Thorn, between the three religions, 349; at Rhanfelt, between the Reformed and the Papists, ibid. in France, between Claude and Bossuet, ibid. at Leipzig, 431; at Thorn, 432; at Cassels, ibid.
- Conrad*, of Lichtenau, his character, i, 634.
- , of Marburg, the first German inquisitor, his barbarity, his fate, i, 699 and [k] [l].
- Constant II*, Emperor, his type, i, 333; imprisons Pope Martin for condemning it, ibid.
- Constantine*, Pogonatus, remits the ordination-money paid by the Popes to the Emperor, i, 321; permits a council at Rome, to condemn the Monothelites, 334.
- , Copronymus, his zeal against images, i, 371.
- Conventual*, Brethren, who, i, 743.
- Cortefius*, his comment on Proverbs, i, 799.
- Cosmas*, a Nestorian, his philosophy, i, 288.
- Covenant*, Gospel dispensation, how far one, ii, 480 [z].
- Council*, Constantinople, in vi cent. condemns the doctrine of Origen, i, 300; in vii century, called quini-sextum, its laws concerning rites and ceremonies, 328 and [g], 336 and [u]; in viii cent. against images, 371.
- Crellius*, his opposition to the form of concord, ii, 185; his fate, ibid. and [l].
- Cudworth*, } moral works, ii, 482.
- Cumberland*, }
- Cusani*, founder of the fathers of the Christian doctrine in Italy, ii, 103.
- Cyran*, Saint, Abbot of, his character and works, ii, 394, 402 [a].
- Cyril*, converts the Bohemians, i, 379.
- D
- Damila*, Nilus, his character, i, 747.
- Decretal*, Epistles, spurious, i, 394 and [z], 395, [a].
- Descartes*, v. Cartes.
- Dezius*, his pacific attempt, ii, 350.
- Dioscorus*, his character, i, 269; his fate, 270.
- Dolet*, supposed infidel, ii, 78.
- Dositheus*, a Samaritan impostor, i, 69.
- Doxopatrius*, Nilus, i, 524.
- Druthmar*, Christian, Comment on St. Matthew, i, 400, 406.
- Dudithius*, account of, ii, 267 [u].
- Duraeus*, his pacific exploits, ii, 432, 433.
- Dungal*, an Irishman, his great character, i, 388; writes in defence of images, 412.
- Durandus*, William Bishop of Mande, i, 681.
- E
- Echellenfis*, Abraham, tries to unite the Greek and Latin Churches, ii, 416; account of his work, ibid. [d].
- Eckius*, one of the first adversaries of Luther, ii, 19; dispute between him and Carlostadt, 23; between him and Luther, 24 and [e]; urges the Pope to excommunicate Luther, 27; his dispute with Melancthon at Worms, 59.
- Eligius*, or *Eloi*, his description of a good Christian, i, 324 [x].
- Elizabeth*, of Schonauge, the prophetess, i, 594.
- Elmacin*, George, his history of the Saracens, i, 632.
- Ennodius*, Bishop of Ticinum, his adulation to the Roman Pontif, i, 289, 291; his works, 294, 298.

Eon,

- Eon*, a fanatic, his wild tenets, i, 619.
Espence, Gaigny de, Comment on the Epistles, ii, 110.
Ethelbert, a monkish historian, i, 444.
Etherianus, Hugo, writes against the Greeks, i, 604.
Eucherius, Bishop of Lyons, his character and works, i, 247.
Eugenius IV, Pope, summons the council of Basil, i, 710; dislikes the proceedings, and summons another at Ferrara, 781; excommunicates those at Basil, *ibid.* deposed by them, 782; removes his council from Ferrara to Florence, *ibid.*
Eugippius, a writer of the Lives of Saints, i, 298.
Eulogius, of Antioch, his works, i, 293.
Exarchs, who, i, 182.
Excommunication, its artificial terrors, i, 351 and [p]; from whence derived, *ib.* controversy concerning it amongst the Anabaptists, ii, 244.

F

Facundus, his works, i, 294.
Felix, Bishop of Urgella, his heresy, i, 366 and [k]; condemned by five councils, 376 and [n]; his sect called Adoptians, 377.
—— V, Duke of Savoy, elected Antipope by the council of Basil, i, 782; resigns, 783.
Fevre, Le, a Protestant peace-maker, ii, 351.
Flaccius, character of him, and of the Centuriæ Magdeburgenses, ii, 154; his dispute with Strigelius, 173, 174, 175; professor of divinity at Jena, 173; his virulence against Melancthon, *ibid.* his friends, 175; his marvellous obstinacy, 176.
Flagellantes, Rise and account of this absurd sect, i, 683; suppressed, 684; appear again, 758; a new sect of them in xv cent. 806; fall under the lash of the Inquisition, *ibid.* and 807.
Flavianus, Bishop of C. P. beat to death by the Bishops in the council of Ephesus, i, 269 and [c], 271 [g].
Florus, his works, i, 387, 400, 406.
Fludd, head of the Rosicrucians, ii, 325.
Forbes, William, Bishop of Edinburgh, his character and pacificatory principles, ii, 352 and [a].
Forer, writes against the Protestants and the peace of Augsburg, ii, 339.
Fortunatus, his works, i, 294.
Fox, George, v. *Quakers*.
Francfort, council in viii cent. confirms the four books, and condemns image-worship, i, 372.
Francis, d'Assis, character of his works, i, 680.
Franciscans, their reputation in xiii cent. i, 656; founder of, his character, 657 and 658 [w]; their services to the Popes, *ibid.* and [x]; contest with the Dominicans, 662; between themselves, *ibid.* progress of it, 663; continued in xiv cent. 734, 735 and 736; divided into two bodies, 743.
Fratricelli, an enthusiastical sect, their rise, tenets, and fate, i, 671 and [o], 672 [p]; their abolition ordered by Pope John XXII, 735; many of them burned for opposing the Pope's orders, 736, 737 and [a]; persecuted again in xv cent. 788; in return put some of the inquisitors to death, 789.
Freculph, the historian, i, 387, 400.
Fredegarius, an historian, i, 324.
Frederic II, Emperor, engages in a crusade, i, 624; crowned King of Jerusalem, *ibid.* his quarrel with the Popes, 645, 646; excommunicated by the Pope, 646; deposed by him, 647.
French, great cultivators of learning in xi cent. i, 479.
Fulbert, Bishop of Chartres, account of, i, 524.
Fulgentius, Ferrandus, his works, i, 294.
——, Bishop of Ruspina, his works, i, 294, 298.

G

Galanus, attempts to reconcile the Greek and Latin Churches, ii, 416; his work, *ibid.* [d].
Galilei, the Astronomer, his character, ii, 321.
Gebhard, Archbishop of Cologne, shews his inclination for Lutheranism, ii, 152; marries, and is obliged to resign his dignity, *ibid.*
Geier, his Comment on Scripture, ii, 453.
Gennadius, or George Scholaris, his character and works, i, 791.
Gentilis, Valentine, his heresy, ii, 262.

George,

ADDITIONS, &c. TO MOSHEIM'S

George, the Cyprian, a Polemic writer, i, 679.

Gerhard, his Exposition of Scripture, ii, 444; his moral writings, 446.

Germanus, Bishop of C. P. his character, and works, i, 361.

Gildas, the monk, his works, i, 295.

Glassius, Solomon, his sacred philosophy, ii, 444; his pacific temper, 453.

Glycas, Michael, the historian, i, 564, 591.

Godfrey, of Boulogne, Duke of Lorrain, his high character, i, 469 and [r] [s]; his success, 470; refuses to be crowned King of Jerusalem, 471 and [z].

Gonesius, introduces the heresy of Servetus into Poland, ii, 263 and [k].

Gorcomius, Henry, his works, i, 792.

Grace, contest concerning it between the Jesuits and Dominicans, ii, 390, 392, [f].

Gras, Le, Louisa, founds a female order of Virgins of Love, or Daughters of Charity, ii, 376.

Gregory, the Enlightener, converts the Armenians, i, 176.

——, Bishop of Nazianzen, and of Nissa, account of them and their works, i, 187.

—— *Thaumaturgus*, his works, and miracles, i, 138.

—— the Great, a multiplier of superstitious rites, i, 303; his canon of the mass, 304; his stations, *ibid.* almost extinguishes the sect of the Donatists, 305.

—— of Tours, his character as a writer, i, 294.

—— *Pilides*, his work, i, 323.

—— II, Pope, excommunicates and deposes Leo the Isaurian, i, 370; his zeal for images, *ibid.* and [s].

—— III, Pope, his zeal for image-worship, i, 370 and [s].

—— VII, Pope, his bad character, i, 467; forms a crusade to invade Palestine, *ibid.* v. *Hildebrand*.

—— X, Pope, his character, i, 649.

—— XI, Pope, his character, i, 727; transfers the Papal seat from Rome to Avignon, 728; repents of it, *ibid.*

—— XII, Anti-pope, i, 770; resigns, 772.

—— XV, Pope, his character, ii, 335, 336.

Gribaldi, Matthew, his heresy, ii, 262.

Grotius, his book *De Jure Belli & Pacis*, ii, 323; his pacific principles, 352; a philosophical Reformer, 438; his hypothesis concerning the Prophets, 479; his Exposition of Scripture, 478.

Guiscard, Robert, Duke of Apulia, drives the Saracens out of Sicily in xi cent.

Guntherus, character of his writings, i, 634.

H

Hackspain, his Exposition of Scripture, ii, 444.

Hager, writes against the Protestants, and the peace of Augsburg, ii, 339.

Halitgarius, a Christian moralist, i, 408.

Hardouin, Father, his atheists detected, ii, 330 [p]; his character, 381.

Harpius, Henry, a mystic, i, 792, 799.

Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt, i, 387; his works, 400, 406, 407.

Hederic, writes against the peace of Augsburg, ii, 339.

Helmont, John Baptist, a Rosacruzian, ii, 325.

Henry, Archbishop of Upsal, founder of the Church of the Finlanders, his zeal, i, 552; massacred and sainted, *ibid.*

Heraclius, the Emperor, persecutes the Jews, and compels them to embrace Christianity, i, 313; his edict, called the *Ecthesis*, to compromise the dispute concerning the one will, and operation in Christ, 333.

Heribald, writes against Radbert Paschasius, i, 414.

Hervæus, Natalis, i, 747.

Hervey, a Benedictine, his Commentaries, i, 597.

Hevelius, his character, ii, 321.

Hierax, account of him and his sect, i, 156.

Hildegard, a pretended prophetess, i, 594.

Hildebrand, his dictates, i, 497 [w]; deposes Basilaus King of Poland, 500; dethrones the Emperor Henry IV, 511; his works, 525; his Commentaries, 527; faints, but his festival not universally received, 513 and [n].

Hoburg, Christian, account of, ii, 470.

Holstenius, Lucas, attempts to reconcile the Greek and Latin Churches, ii, 416 and [d].

Huber,

Huber, Samuel, his controversy concerning predestination, ii, 185; deposed and banished from Wittemberg, 186.

Huet, Bishop of Avranches, a sceptical philosopher, ii, 334.

Huiffeaux, of Saumur, his pacificatory principles, ii, 351.

Humbert, Cardinal, account of his works, i, 524.

I

Jacobites, a sect of the Monophysites, why so called, and from whom, i, 307, ii, 133 and [b].

Jagello, Duke of Lithuania, by what means converted, i, 713; changes his name to Uladislaus, *ibid.*

Jerom, of Palestine, his character and works, i, 189.

—, de St. Foi, refutes the Jews, in xv cent. i, 800.

Jerusalem, Patriarch of, his Jurisdiction, ii, 127.

Jesuates, or Apostolic Clerks, when founded, i, 743; abolished by Clement IX, Pope, *ibid.*

Ignatius, Patriarch of C. P. deprived by the Emperor, i, 419; restored by the Pope, to whom he had appealed, 420; reinstated by the Emperor, *ibid.* refuses to give up any of his provinces to the see of Rome, *ibid.* his death, 422.

Impostors, The Three, by whom written. i, 630.

Innocent II, Pope, exempts the Cistercians from paying tithes, i, 586.

— III, Pope, augments the wealth and power of the Pope, i, 642; his quarrel with John King of England, 643; lays the kingdom under an interdict, *ibid.*

— VII, Anti-pope, i, 769.

— X, Pope, his Bull against the treaty of Munster, ii, 344 [y].

— XI, his dispute with Lewis XIV of France, ii, 365.

Joannes, Joannellus, a Mystic, i, 530.

John, of Capua, a monkish historian, i, 444.

—, of C. P. or the Faster, assumed the title of universal Bishop, i, 288; his works, 293.

— IV, Pope, rejects the Ecthesis of Vol. III.

Heraclius, and condemns the Monothelites, i, 333.

John XXII, Pope, his severity to the Fratricelli, i, 734, 736; disputes between him and the Franciscans, concerning the poverty of Christ, 738; they side with the Emperor against him, 740; he is reconciled to them, 741; his fruitless endeavours to suppress the brethren of the free spirit, 757.

— XXIII, Anti-pope, his infamous character, i, 770; summons a council at Constans, 771; deposed by it, *ibid.*

—, King of England, his contest with Innocent III, Pope, i, 643; excommunicated and deposed by him, 644; resigns his crown, and swears fealty to him, 645.

—, the sophist, the chief of the nominalists, i, 485; his disciples, *ibid.*

—, of Scythopolis, his Comment on the pretended Dionysius the Areopagite, i, 298.

Irenæus, account of his writings, i, 89.

Irish, the greatest cultivators of learning in viii cent. i, 366 and [m].

Irnerius, whether he persuaded the Emperor Lotharius II, to substitute the Roman Law instead of others, i, 567 and 568 [s].

Jubilee year, when instituted, i, 693, 694 [u] [w] [z].

Julian, Bishop of Halicarnassus, his doctrine concerning the body of Christ, i, 308; names given to his followers, *ibid.*

Julius, Africanus, his character and works, i, 138.

Junilius, his works, i, 296.

Ivo, Bishop of Chartres, i, 525.

Justinian, Emperor, his edict against Origen, i, 300; and against the three chapters, 301; drives the Vandals out of Africa, and Goths out of Italy, 305; his Pandect, when, where, by whom, and how found, 567.

—, Lawrence, a Mystic, i, 792, 799.

—, Benedict, Comment on St. Paul's Epistles, ii, 110.

Isidore, of Seville, his works, i, 295, 297, 299.

P

Kepler,

ADDITIONS, &c. TO MOSHEIM'S

K

- Kepler*, his character, ii, 321.
Knights Sword-bearers, a military order, founded to convert the Livonians, i, 552.
Knox, founder of the Church of Scotland, ii, 204.

L

- La Trappe*, Bouthillier de Rance, Abbot of, opposes the congregation of St. Maur, ii, 373 [x]; account of, 374 [b]; founder of the order of the reformed Benedictines, 376.
Leibnitz, his character, ii, 32; his philosophy, 331 and [r]; revives the study of philosophy, 571.
Leipfic, when and by whom made an university, i, 774.
Leo IV, Emperor, his zeal against images, i, 731; poisoned by his wife Irene, ib.
 — VI, Emperor, surnamed the Wife, writes against the Saracens, i, 409.
 —, the Isaurian Emperor, his contest with the Pope, i, 357; increases the power of the see of C. P. ibid. his edict against images, 369 and [r].
 — IX, Pope, aims at universal dominion, i, 486; gives the Normans their conquered countries, 487; his character, 488; excommunicates the Greek Churches, i, 531; and their Patriarch with his adherents, 532; condemns the doctrine of Berenger in two councils, 534.
Leonardi, a follower of Servetus, ii, 262.
Leontius, of Byzantium, his works, i, 293, 297.
 —, of Neapolis, writer against the Jews, i, 299.
Leucopetus, founder of a fanatical sect, account of him and his tenets, i, 608.
Leutheric, Archbishop of Sens, his notion that none but good men received the body of Christ, i, 534.
Lewis, Emperor, son of Charlemagne, falsely called the Meek, his character, i, 378; a patron of arts and sciences, 385; his forged donation to the see of Rome, 392; his edict in behalf of the Pope's election spurious, 391 and [q].
 — IX, of France, afterwards sainted, his two unsuccessful crusades, i, 625, 626; secures the rights of the Gallican

Church by the pragmatic sanction, 641; character and acts, 642.

- XIV, of France, a patron of arts and sciences, ii, 321.
Liberatus, his works, i, 294.
Locke, John, ii, 332.
London, Royal Society, ibid.
Lucifer, Bishop of Cagliari, his character and sect, i, 202.
Lucius II, Pope, killed in a riot, i, 577 and [n].
Luitprand, a monkish historian, i, 444.
Lupus, Servatus, i, 387; his great abilities, 389, 407; his works, 400.
Lutkeman, Joachim, his tenets, ii, 466.
Lyranus, Nicolas, his Exposition of the Scriptures, i, 747.

M

- Macarius*, Macres, violent against the Latins, i, 790.
Mahomet, dispute concerning his God, i, 605.
Malebranche, Father, charged by Hardouin with Atheism, ii, 330; his philosophy, 331 and [r].
Maldonate, John, his Comment on St. Paul's Epistles, ii, 110.
Mapes, Walter, his character, i, 634.
Marcellus, his reconciling attempt, ii, 350.
Marculf, the monk, his works, i, 323.
Marcus, Ephesus, i, 790.
Maria, Ave, when added in the Prayers, i, 753.
Marino, Robert, i, 634.
Marius, Mercator, his works, i, 247.
Mark, the hermit, his works, i, 253.
Maronius, Francis, his works, i, 747.
Marriages, fourth, prohibited by a council at C. P. in x cent. i, 461.
Martin, of Braga, his practical writings, i, 298.
 —, Pope, condemns the Ecthesis of Heraclius, and the Type of Constans, i, 333.
 —, of Poland, i, 634.
 — IV, Pope, his character, i, 649.
 — V, Pope, elected in the council of Constans, i, 772.
Masenius, his reconciling attempt, ii, 350.
Massilians, a general name for Eastern heretics, i, 608.
Masses, solitary, when supposed to be introduced, i, 374; what, ibid. [d].

Muttbilda

- Matthilda*, Dutcheſs of Tuscany, her donation to the ſee of Rome, i, 501 [o].
Matthiæ, John, Biſhop of Strengnes in Sweden, his pacific principles, ii, 434; his fate, 435.
Mauritius, Peter, writes againſt the Jews, i, 603.
Mayer, Michael, a Roſecrucian, ii, 325.
Maxentius, of Antioch, his works, i, 293.
Maximus, of Turin, his Homilies, i, 247.
Mediciſ, Coſmo de, patron of the Platonic philoſophy, i, 766, and of learned men, 767.
Melancthon, ſends a Greek tranſlation of the confeſſion of Augſburg to the Patriarch of C. P. ii, 129.
Meletian, ſchiſm, condemned in the council of Nice, i, 218 and [t] [u].
Melitemata, } George, account of, i, 679.
Metochita, }
Menander, his wild tenets, i, 68.
Mendæans, or Chriſtians of St. John, account of, ii, 138, 139 [d].
Mendez, Patriarch of the Abyſſinians, v. *Abyſſinia*.
Meth, Ezekiel, account of that fanatic, ii, 470.
Methodius, the Confefſor, his zeal for image-worſhip, i, 398; his Panegyric on Dionyſius, 408.
Middleton, Richard, i, 681.
Milletier, his pacific principles, ii, 351.
Miltitz, v. *Luther*.
Miſſions, prieſts of, a new order in xvii cent. ii, 376.
——, account of in xviii cent. ii, 559; Proteſtant, particularly the Daniſh, 561.
Mogiſlaus, Biſhop of Kiow, his Confeſſion of Faith for the Greek Church, ii, 129.
Monarchy, Fifth, Men, a ſect of enthuſiaſts, ii, 503.
Montagne, a ſuppoſed infidel, ii, 78.
Monks, zealots for image-worſhip, i, 371.
Monophyſites, their ſtate in vi cent. i, 307; internal diſputes, 308; ſtate in vii cent. 331; their doctrine, ii, 134; their ignorance, 135; ſtate in xviii cent. 568.
Moors, or Saracens, how converted in xv cent. i, 761.
Moscow, Patriarch of, when firſt made, ii, 132; when exempted from the Patriarch of C. P. ibid.
Morinus, his attempt to unite the Greek and Latin Churches, ii, 416 and [d].
Mofes, Cretenſis, account of that impoſtor, i, 230 and [y].
Moulin, Peter de, employed to unite the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, ii, 430.

N

Nangis, William of, his character, i, 634.
Nestorians, plant Chriſtianity, in x cent. beyond Mount Imaus, and in Tartary, i, 431; ſtate in xviii cent. ii, 568.
Nicephorus, Gregoras, character, i, 716; works, 746.
——, Patriarch of C. P. his writings, i, 398.
Nicetas, David, the Paphlagonian, ibid.
——, Choniates, a Greek hiftorian, i, 631.
Nicetius, of Triers, his writings, i, 298.
Nicholas, Patriarch of C. P. ſuſpends the Emperor Leo, the philoſopher, for marrying a fourth wife, i, 460; deprived by the Emperor, 461; reſtored by his ſon, ibid.
—— IV, Pope, refuſes to crown the Emperor Rodolphus, till he acknowledged the Papal pretenſions, i, 642; his character, 649.
Nicon, his work concerning the religion of the Armenians, i, 454.
Nieder, John, his works, i, 792.
Nilus, character of his writings, i, 246.
Nogaret, William de, proſecutes his accuſation againſt Boniface VIII after his death, i, 722, 724.
Nominaliſts, riſe of their controversy with the Realists in x cent. i, 444; continued in xi cent. 484; in xii cent. 570; in xv cent. 768.
Normans, ſoftened by living amongſt Chriſtians, i, 383.
Notker, a monkish hiftorian, i, 444.

O

Ochin, a ſuppoſed infidel writer, ii, 78.
Oecumenius, his chain, i, 454.
Olaus, King of Norway, converted to Chriſtianity, ſainted, i, 436; eſtabliſhes the Goſpel, and by what methods, 437 [u].
Olympia, Donna, her illicit commerce with Pope Innocent X, ii, 336 and [e].

P 2

Optatus, a Numidian Bishop, writes against the Donatists, i, 190.

Otho, the Great, invited into Italy by Pope John XII, who salutes him with the title of Emperor of the Romans, i, 449; maintains his supremacy over the Bishop of Rome, 451.

— IV, Emperor, excommunicated and deposed by Innocent III, i, 643.

P

Paris, the first university, when so called, and why, i, 632; severe course of discipline, 633.

—, academy of sciences, high character of, ii, 332.

—, Abbé, pretended miracles at his tomb, ii, 557.

Paruta, his heresy, ii, 262, 263.

Paschal, account of his provincial letters, ii, 386 [w].

— II, Pope, renews the dispute concerning investitures, i, 572; imprisoned by the Emperor, 574; yields the ring and crozier, *ibid.* annuls this act, and excommunicates the Emperor, *ibid.*

Patarenus, a common name for all heretics, origin of it, i, 503 [r].

Paulinus, of Aquileia, his character and works, i, 352.

Peckham, John de, his works, i, 681.

Pepin, in viii cent, usurps the crown of France, i, 352; encouraged and supported by Pope Zachary, *ibid.* and [q]; anointed and crowned by Pope Stephen, ii, 353 and [r]; his donation to the see of Rome, *ibid.* and 354 [t].

Peraldus, William, his works, i, 681.

Perieres, Bonaventure des, supposed infidel, ii, 78.

Perrault, account of his book, *La Morale des Jesuites*, ii, 386 [w]; Jesuits method of confuting it, *ibid.*

Peter, the Hermit, solicits a crusade, i, 468; leads a division of the army, 469; defeated, 470 [w].

—, of Celle, attacks the scholastics, i, 600.

—, Pence, what, and why so called, i, 499 [e].

—, of Ravenna, his works, i, 247.

Petit, John, his doctrine concerning the lawfulness of putting a tyrant to death,

i, 778; censured by the university of Paris, and council of Constans, *ibid.*

Pezelius, his Catechism, ii, 180.

Pfaff, Matthew, his project to unite the Lutheran and Reformed Churches, ii, 575 and [b].

Philippus, Solitarius, his works, i, 590, 602.

Philotheus, his works, i, 747.

Phranza, George, his works, i, 790.

Pichon, the Jesuit, renews the dispute concerning the frequent receiving the Eucharist, ii, 119.

Pictet, his moral works, ii, 481.

Pisanus, Raynerius, his summary, i, 747.

Piscator, John, his doctrine concerning the obedience of Christ, ii, 485.

Pisides, Gregory, his works, i, 323.

Pistorius, writes against the treaty of Passau, ii, 152.

Planudas, Maximus, his character, i, 717.

Plotinus, with the Christians, opposes the Gnostics, i, 151.

Politian, a supposed infidel writer, ii, 78.

Pomponace, Peter, his Pantheistical system, i, 768.

Pontius, of Nola, his character, and works, i, 247.

Popery, remarkable converts to, in xvii cent. ii, 355, 356.

Possevin, Anthony, a Jesuit Missionary, his vain attempt to unite the Romish and Russian Churches, ii, 142; writes against the Protestants, 339.

Predestination, controversy about it in xvi cent. ii, 194.

Q

Quesnel, his New Testament, character of, ii, 389 and [c], v. *Church Romish*.

R

Rabanus, Maurus, Archbishop of Mentz, writes against the Jews, i, 409; against Radbert, 414; against Godeschalvus, 416; rise of the quarrel between them, 418 (r).

Rabelais, a supposed infidel, ii, 78.

Radbert, Paschasius, his dispute with Bertram concerning the manner of Christ's birth, i, 419.

Raham, v. *Bertram*.

Ratherius, a monkish historian, i, 455.

Raymund, of Sabunde, his natural theology, i, 800.

Regino,

- Regino*, Abbot of Prüm, i, 401.
Rechenberg, defends the tenets of Bofius, ii, 463.
Reinboth, his singular opinions, ii, 466; opposed by Danhauer, *ibid.*
Reineccius, his knowledge of history, ii, 154.
Relics, veneration for them in ix cent. i, 404; by what arts collected, 405.
Remi, Archbishop of Lyons, defends Godeschalcus, i, 417.
Rheims, William of, his works, i, 592.
Rhodius, Nilus, his character, i, 747.
Rickel, Dionysius, a Mystic, i, 799.
Rimini, Gregory de, i, 747.
Robert, King of France, a patron of learning, i, 479.
 ———, Abbot of Moleme, founder of the Cistercian order, i, 518.
Robas, Christopher, Bishop of Tinia, his reconciling attempt, ii, 351.
Rome, its Bishop, when, how, and by whom, raised to the rank of a temporal Prince, i, 354 and [t]; limited by and under the Emperor, 359 [s]; and 360 [l] [m] [n] [o]; the Emperor's approbation necessary to his consecration, 390; his power augmented in ix cent. and by what means, 394; his frauds and forgeries to support his claim, *ib.* and [y] [z], and 395 [a] [c]; his power how increased in x cent. 451; in xi cent. 486; his claim over the kingdom of Sicily, 490; his advantage by the disputes concerning the empire in ix cent. 393; origin of the dispute with the Kings of Sicily concerning the spiritual supremacy, 467.
Romuald, founder of the Cameldolites, xi cent. i, 518.
Rusbrockius, John, his character, i, 747.
 S
Sacrament, festival, its origin, i, 693 and [s].
Saints, account of those made in xvii cent. ii, 413, 414 and [z].
Salabert, his defence of the nominalists, i, 484 [q].
Saladin, defeated by the Kings of France and England, i, 559; makes a truce with them, *ibid.*
Salernum, a famous school for the study of physic, in xi cent. i, 480, 481 [n], 566.
Salisbury, John of, ridicules the disputes between the Nominalists and Realists, i, 570 [s], 571 [t].
Samuel, a Jewish convert, writes against the Jews, i, 530.
Sandius, a Socinian writer, ii, 552.
Sanchez, a sceptical philosopher, ii, 334.
Saracens, persecute the Christians in xii cent. i, 562; attempts made to drive them out of Spain in xiv cent. 714; how converted in Spain in xv cent. 761; v. *Arabians*, *Moors*.
Schioppius, writes against the Protestants, ii, 339.
Schmidt, Erasmus, } their Expositions
 ———, Sebastian, } of the Scriptures, ii, 444.
Schoman, author of the Cracow Catechism, ii, 268 [z]; his Testamentum, 271 [a].
Schomer, his Comment on Scripture, ii, 453.
Sclavonians, and Dalmatians, signify a desire to embrace Christianity in ix cent. i, 379; missionaries sent amongst them, 380 and [f].
Scylizes, John, an historian, i, 478.
Servites, convent of, when founded, i, 653.
Severus, the Monothelite, made by Anastasius Patriarch of Antioch, i, 306; expelled, 307; succeeded by one of his own sect, *ibid.* his doctrine concerning the body of Christ, 308; names given to his followers, *ibid.*
Sharrock, his moral writings, ii, 482.
Siculus, Peter, i, 398.
Simeon, the Metaphrast, account of him, i, 454.
Smaragdus, his skill in grammar, i, 387, 407.
Sophronius, of Jerusalem, an enemy to the Monothelites, i, 332; condemns them as heretics, *ibid.*
Spener, his method of teaching theology, ii, 445; how far successful, 446.
Stephen, de Muret, founder of the grand mountain order, i, 519.
Sterconarism, what so called, i, 415.
Steuber, } seditious fanatics in xvi cent.
Storchius, } ii, 163.
Stockius, Simon, a fanatic Carmelite, his vision, i, 661. *Straßburgh*,

INDEX.

Strasburgh, Thomas of, i, 747.*Susneius*, or Seltam Segned, Emperor of the East, encourages the Jesuit missionaries in Abyssinia, ii, 357.*Symmachus*, dispute between him and Laurentius, concerning their election to the see of Rome, i, 290; defended by Ennodius, 291 and [c].*Synergists*, v. *Controversy*.

T

Tanner, writes against the Protestants, ii, 339.*Tarnovius*, his Expositions of Scripture, ii, 444; his writings censured, 446.*Taulerus*, John, his character, i, 747.*Taurellus*, a supposed infidel writer, ii, 78.*Thegan*, an historian, i, 387.*Theodmir*, a Benedictin, writes in defence of image-worship, i, 412.*Theodore*, of Cæsarea, persuades the Emperor Justinian to condemn the three chapters, i, 300.*Theodorus*, Lascarus, his works, i, 679.

——, Metochita, character of, i, 716.

Theodosius, of Alexandria, seconds Jacob Baradeus in reviving the sect of the Monophysites, i, 307.*Theophanes*, his character, i, 747.*Thomasius*, his philosophy, ii, 439; adopted at Halle, *ibid.* his plan of reforming the Lutheran Church, 442 and [x].*Thorn*, charitable conference there, ii, 348.*Timotheus*, the Nestorian Pontif, converts the Hircanians and Tartars, i, 337.*Titelman*, Francis, Comment on St. Paul's Epistles, ii, 110.*Toleration*, the act for it in England, ii, 507 and [b].*Trinity*, fraternity of, i, 653; called also Mathurins, 654 and [m].

U

Udalric, Bishop of Augsburg, the first person solemnly fainted by the Pope, i, 403 and 459.*Ulgerius*, Bishop of Angers, founds an academy there, i, 565.*Unitarians*, v. *Socinians*.*Urban II*, Pope, promotes a crusade, i, 468; his character, 514; the troubles of his pontificate, *ibid.* his arrogance, 515.*Urban IV*, Pope, institutes the festival of the body of Christ, i, 648; confers the kingdom of Naples upon Charles, brother to Lewis IX, of France, *ibid.*

—— V, his character, i, 727.

—— VIII, Pope, attempts an union between the Greek and Roman Churches, ii, 416.

V

Vayer, de la Mothe, a sceptical philosopher, ii, 334.*Vincent*, of Beauvois, his character, i, 634.

——, of Ferrara, a Mystic, i, 792, 799.

Volusius, his reconciling attempt, ii, 350.*Voragme*, Jacobus de, his history of the Lombards, i, 680.

W

Wake, Archbishop of Canterbury, his answer to Bossuet's Exposition, ii, 350 [w].*Wallis*, John, his ardour for natural knowledge, ii, 332.*War*, Holy, history of it in xi cent. i, 469; why undertaken, 471 and [y]; bad consequences, 472—475 and notes; renewed in xii cent. 556; unsuccessful, 557; a third expedition, 558; its issue, 559, v. *Crusades*.*Weigelius*, a Paracelsist, ii, 157.*Whitby*, Dr. account of his dissertation on the interpreting of the Scriptures, ii, 480 [y].*William*, the Conqueror, his great character, i, 479; refuses to do homage to the Pope, 499 and [f].*Wirker*, Nigel, an English bard, his satire upon the monks, i, 584 [d].*Wolff*, revives the study of philosophy in xviii cent. ii, 571.

X

Xenaius, of Hierapolis, his hypothesis concerning the body of Christ, i, 308.

Z

Zachary, Pope, deposes Childeric III, King of France, and gives it to Pepin, i, 352 and [q].*Zanchius*, revives the predestinarian controversy, ii, 195.*Zosimus*, Pope, first acquits, and afterwards condemns, Pelagius and Cœlestius, i, 276 and [d].

ADVERTISEMENT.

AFTER the foregoing sheets were printed off, I was favoured, by the very worthy descendants of the pious and learned Archbishop SHARP, with the present of a small but curious work, lately published, which belongs to the Ecclesiastical History of the eighteenth century. It contains an *Account* of the measures that were taken, and of the correspondence that was carried on, in the years 1711, 1712, and 1713, for the introduction of the Liturgy of the Church of *England* into the kingdom of *Prussia* and the electorate of *Hanover*. To this historical account are annexed several letters and original papers, that are very interesting, more especially, a *Plan of Ecclesiastical Discipline and Publick Worship*, drawn up by the learned Dr. JABLONSKY, and some other papers of the same author, concerning the nature of episcopacy and the manner of rendering it compatible with the interests of the sovereign and the religious liberty of the people.

This publication, which is chiefly designed for the use of the Protestants in *Prussia*, is drawn from manuscript memoirs of the Life of Archbishop SHARP, who was principally concerned in the transactions and correspondence above-mentioned. These memoirs were composed from the Archbishop's Journal by his son, the learned Dr. THOMAS SHARP, Archdeacon of *Northumberland*, and the historical account drawn from them of the project for introducing episcopacy into *Prussia*, is published in a *French* translation, done by the Reverend Mr. MUYSSON, Minister of the *French* Chapel at *St. James's*, &c.

The following note refers to the last paragraph of page 713 of the first volume of the quarto edition.

DR. MOSHEIM does not pretend to determine whether these reports relative to the barbarity of the Jews were true or false; but it seems more than probable, that they were insidiously forged, out of hatred against that unfortunate people. This will appear still more evidently to have been the case, when we consider that, in the thirteenth century, the Popes GREGORY IX and INNOCENT IV published declarations, which were designed to destroy the effect of several calumnies that had been invented and dispersed to the disadvantage of the Jews; and in the fourteenth century we find the *Roman* Pontiffs, BENEDICT XII and CLEMENT VI giving the same proofs of their equity towards an injured people. We find in history circular letters of the Dukes of *Milan* and *Venice*, and Imperial edicts of FREDERICK III and CHARLES V to the same purpose; and all these circumstances render it highly credible that the reports, mentioned by Dr. MOSHEIM, are not founded on sufficient evidence.

ADVERTISEMENT.

AFTER the foregoing sheets were printed off I was favoured by the
worthy descendants of the pious and learned Archbishop Sharpe, who had printed
a small but curious work, lately published, which belongs to the Ecclesiastical
of the eighteenth century. It contains an account of the measures that were taken
and of the correspondence that was carried on, in the years 1711, 1712, and 1713
for the introduction of the liturgy of the Church of England into the Church of
Rome and the election of Haines. To this historical account are prefixed several
letters and original papers, that are very interesting, more especially a letter of
Archbishop Haines to the Pope, which I have drawn up by the learned Dr. Haines
and some other papers of the same author, concerning the state of the Church
the manner of rendering it compatible with the interests of the Pope and the
religious liberty of the people.

This publication, which is chiefly designed for the use of the Protestants in Rome,
is drawn from manuscript memoirs of the late Archbishop Sharpe, who was prin-
cipally concerned in the transactions above mentioned. These
memoirs were compiled from the original papers by his son, the learned Dr.
Thomas Sharpe, Archbishop of York. The historical account is drawn
from them of the project for introducing the liturgy, as published in a
French translation, done by the Reverend Mr. Morrison, Minister of the French
Chapel at St. James's, &c.



The following are the titles of the papers of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.

Dr. Mosheim does not pretend to determine whether these reports relative to the
barbarity of the Jews were true or false; but it seems more than probable, that they
were indubitably false, out of hatred against that unfortunate people. This will
be still more evident, if we consider the case, when we find that in the
century, the Popes Gregory IX and Innocent IV published bulls, which
were designed to destroy the Jews, and to deprive them of all their rights and
privileges, and to the disadvantage of the Jews; and in the fourteenth century we find the
Roman Pontiff, Benedict XII, and Clement VI giving the same bulls of war
against the Jews. We find in the history several instances of the Jews
of Africa and Syria, and in the present edition of the Popes Gregory IX and
Clement VI to the same purpose; and all these circumstances render it highly probable that the reports
mentioned by Dr. Mosheim, are not founded on sufficient evidence.

